United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.20

General Assembly
Fiftieth session
*Official Records*

First Committee

**20**th Meeting
Tuesday, 14 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

*Chairman:* Mr. Erdenechuluun ..... (Mongolia)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.*

**Agenda items 57 to 81** *(continued)*

**Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items**

**Mr. Butler** (Australia): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first occasion on which I have spoken in the First Committee under your chairmanship, let me say how very much personal pleasure it gives me to see you in the Chair.

I am grateful to you and to the Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak at this moment. My purpose is to report to you and to the Committee on consultations that have taken place since the Committee met yesterday afternoon. I propose to be as brief as possible, and at the end of this report I will put to you and to the Committee a proposed decision, on the basis of which we should be able to get on with our work expeditiously.

At the meeting of the Committee yesterday afternoon, Mr. Chairman, you drew attention to the fact that some draft resolutions had been deferred in terms of the time at which the First Committee would take action on them. Typically, you said, that had occurred because consultations were taking place with respect to those draft resolutions.

Turning to the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, it was made clear that there were no ongoing consultations on that text and that therefore, at least implicitly, there was no reason for a deferment of action upon it. Nevertheless, one delegation did indicate that it had accepted that there might be a deferment of action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, apparently because such a deferment had been considered desirable by at least one other delegation.

Now, I draw attention to the fact that in what I have said so far, two key concepts are at issue. One, deferment on the basis of consultations that were ongoing — it was acknowledged that there were no such ongoing consultations with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. In addition, "deferment" implies the existence of a notional time at which it would be appropriate to take action. There is such a time with respect to A/C.1/50/L.3, and that time was already to have begun today.

Going further in this I hope not-too-laborious narrative, another delegation immediately indicated that it had not been consulted on the action for deferment and said, as an aside, that it was not going to ask for immediate action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, thus implying that it was ready to do so, but would accept what seemed to be emerging with respect to deferment. You, Mr. Chairman, then indicated that you had in mind that that deferment should be until Friday of this week, 17 November. That seemed to bring to conclusion the exchange.

However, the floor was then subsequently taken by Ambassador Starr, of Australia, who gave a very careful report to the Committee. He indicated that while some consultations had taken place, these had not included all of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, and that under those circumstances it was of course essential that the view of the co-sponsors of the very document at issue be sought. He undertook to seek that view. He made a public announcement that there would be a meeting at 12 noon

95-86654 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

today, at a place to be specified in the *Journal*, for the purpose specifically of forming a view on the proposed timing of action on this draft resolution. That is precisely the issue, half a discussion of which had already taken place yesterday afternoon. He gave notice that a principal group of countries, a substantial group of Member States concerned with this draft resolution, would need to be consulted before they could give their agreement to a proposal for a specific date of action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

I want to record that the Chair — and we thank you for this — acknowledged the importance of having those consultations take place and expressed regret that because of pressure of time, which we all understand, they had not taken place as fully as he himself would have wanted them to. But he acknowledged the importance of those consultations to complete the circle of consultations needed in order to arrive at a decision on when — the merely procedural question — action could be agreed upon to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Now, my report to you is simple: The co-sponsors have met, as they promised they would, and they do have a view on when that deferred action — deferred from today — should be, and that is, that it should be tomorrow, 15 November.

There are a number of reasons for this. As has already been acknowledged, no further consultations are taking place on this draft resolution. It is complete; it has been before the Committee for more than two weeks. It would be normal for it to be taken in the clusters that are now being considered. The co-sponsors know of no reason for any further deferment. Deferment from today until tomorrow seems to us to be sufficient.

Finally, we are grateful to you, Sir, for the way in which you have conducted these proceedings. The discussion yesterday afternoon elucidated the matter, and it became clear that there was a need for further consultation. That has now taken place, and it has been my honour to report to you the result of that consultation. As a consequence, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3, I now propose formally to this Committee that, as a matter of procedural decision, we agree — and this should be our final decision — that action be taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, Wednesday, 15 November.

**The Chairman:** A specific proposal has been made by the representative of Australia.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank you, Sir, for enabling me to share with this Committee, on behalf of the European countries, our reaction to the statement just made by the representative of Australia.

We have listened very closely to what the Ambassador of Australia has said, but I should like to approach this issue from another standpoint — a fundamentally pragmatic standpoint. This different approach derives from the fact that a debate was held yesterday on the issue, which prompted many delegations, including my own, to take the view that the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 had been postponed until next Friday.

Many delegations of the European Union, including my own — which, as the Chairman is aware, is paying close attention to, and is deeply concerned by, the issue taken up in A/C.1/50/L.3 — have informed their Governments that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would be voted on only on Friday. Thus many Foreign Ministries are operating on that assumption. In these circumstances, it is hard to imagine that the countries on whose behalf I am speaking will be in a position to take a stand tomorrow on this draft resolution.

Consequently, I would request reconsideration of this proposal, taking into account the reasons that I have just cited and all their practical implications.

**Mr. Felício** (Brazil): Yesterday, when you, Sir, announced that action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 would be taken on Friday, my delegation regretted that it had not taken part in the consultations that enabled you to make that proposal. I am pleased to announce, however, that you did consult the co-sponsors of the draft resolution this morning, and we consider that the discussion we are having now is a relevant and important one.

My delegation would like also to announce that it is ready to vote on the draft resolution, as soon as possible.

Our understanding is that all delegations should by now have instructions to vote on the condemnation of nuclear-test explosions and on their immediate cessation. My delegation is of the view that coherence is needed here; we hope, therefore, that all countries sharing common objectives on non-proliferation will vote in favour of

condemning nuclear-test explosions, as called for in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. Our immediate action is required.

**Mr. Yarka** (Papua New Guinea): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 is the result of many days of consultations conducted by the core group representing almost all regions, and we were pleased when the draft was submitted to this Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. The draft has therefore been with the Committee for some time, as indicated by Ambassador Butler of Australia, and within this time-frame, no delegation has requested amendments or further consultations to accommodate elements of interest to them.

Like other co-sponsors, my delegation expected action to be taken on this draft today. However, since the announcement yesterday evening that a particular delegation had sought deferment on the draft, we all were upset and could not come to terms with the explanation given. We did, however, appreciate your explanation that it was physically impossible yesterday for you, Sir, to consult all co-sponsors on A/C.1/50/L.3 concerning the request for deferment.

If a particular delegation had any proposals concerning, or amendments to be made to, this draft resolution, this unfortunately was not brought to the attention of the co-sponsors in the three- week period since the draft was introduced. Why should action on A/C.1/50/L.3 unnecessarily be delayed when there are no current or proposed consultations to be conducted on this draft? We believe that the opponents of this draft resolution and their supporters are simply trying to mislead this Committee, and derail its work. We would urge the Committee to seriously consider the proposal submitted by the Ambassador of Australia.

Before the meeting closed yesterday, Ambassador Starr of Australia informed this Committee that the co-sponsors would meet this morning to hear views on what we could do to bring the date for action on this draft resolution forward. As indicated by Ambassador Butler, the co-sponsors decided this morning, and once again this afternoon, to take action on this draft — not on Friday, as requested by the opponents of the draft resolution, but tomorrow.

Furthermore, it is also our understanding that you, Sir, want the Committee to complete action on all disarmament issues this week. We believe that since other draft resolutions are being discussed — to which further amendments are being made and on which consultations are continuing — we need to direct our efforts and energies to those, instead of deliberately delaying a draft resolution that has no amendments and on which no further consultations are scheduled.

Therefore, I should like the Committee to take into account the comments made here, and my delegation would urge it also to take action on A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, and not complicate the work of this Committee by deferrals that serve no good purpose.

**Mr. Leung** (Fiji): After the lucid and accurate summation by Ambassador Butler of Australia, it is my respectful suggestion or recommendation that we act on his proposal. As a member of the group of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, I may say that the necessary consultation process has taken place, our views were solicited and our clear expression of opinion is that the deferment should continue only as far as tomorrow.

It is my delegation's view, therefore, that in these circumstances Ambassador Butler's eminently reasonable proposal should be accepted.

**Mr. Amar** (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): As the representative of Spain has so cogently said, and following the Chairman's statement yesterday, I think we should respect the decision of the Chair and defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 until Friday. My Ministry is informed of the date, and it would be difficult to inform my authorities today of any further change of date.

A representative has referred to the draft resolution as condemning nuclear testing. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 does not speak of condemnation. It merely "strongly deplores".

**Mr. Álvarez** (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the opinion of Uruguay there was no discussion of this issue yesterday. We simply stated that there had been a request on the part of one delegation that the matter be deferred until Friday. There can hardly have been a discussion when no delegation in the room suggested that there should be a postponement. It was agreed that consultations were going to be held with the co-sponsors to determine when that statement was going to be taken into account.

As we understand it, those consultations were held and the co-sponsors have expressed the wish that action should be taken on the draft resolution tomorrow. My delegation

is even prepared to vote on the draft resolution today, if necessary.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I just wondered if I might ask for a clarification from the co-sponsors. We have heard that they want to vote tomorrow, and I just wonder if they could explain why it is that they want to change the decision the Chairman made. One would have the impression, perhaps, that they are running scared and that they think that their support is evaporating.

**Mr. Butler** (Australia): I think all of the sponsors of the draft resolution are very grateful to the Committee for the hearing that has been given it in these few moments this afternoon — a hearing on a matter of profound importance to all of the co-sponsors. I would like to respond on their behalf to one or two of the points that have been made and end with an appeal to our colleagues for cooperation.

First of all, the representative of Spain, speaking on behalf, I think, of members of the European Union, and presumably the United Kingdom as one such member, indicated that there would be difficulty in informing Governments of a change of date. With deepest respect to him and to his colleagues, I must say that what in fact he is putting to us is, that it would be difficult to inform capitals that the advice provided last night was in fact erroneous — wrong — because it was very clear last night that the matter was not settled. That is precisely why the co-sponsors indicated last night that there would be a further meeting and that the outcome of that meeting would be respectfully reported to the Committee, as has been done today. It is very difficult to accept that the co-sponsors could or should be held responsible for an error of this kind, that is, informing Governments of a decision that was not final, that was only in process and under continuing consideration.

Secondly, with respect to the text itself, there have been some implications that there is perhaps something new in it or that it requires further study. I make the very obvious point that this text bears the symbol A/C.1/50/L.3. It is therefore one of the very first of the proposals lodged with the Committee for decision. I am well aware that that does not mean that it is to be taken third, but those numbers are allocated as the texts are submitted. This one was submitted on 31 October and it has been available in precisely its present form in all languages since 2 November. It bears the symbol A/C.1/50/L.3. Its content is well known.

Another delegation spoke of the inconvenience of a change of dates. Dates are frequently changed in this Committee. It is not a new phenomenon. In respect to this particular draft resolution, we have been doing what we normally do, which is to enter into consultation about the date on which it would be agreed or considered appropriate for action to take place. The co-sponsors are of the firm view that that appropriate point of action, although it involves a deferment, is tomorrow, and that is why they have made that submission.

Finally, with respect to the question posed by the representative of the United Kingdom, who ended by asking, "Why do we want to change a decision that was taken yesterday?" I can only repeat what I said at the beginning to the representative of Spain, namely: there was not a final decision yesterday. We began a process of arriving at a decision, which was never to have been complete until the co-sponsors had met. We are not proposing a change in something that was advanced yesterday. We are completing the process that was started yesterday and advising our view of what would be an appropriate date. With respect to the other part of his statement — the humorous part — I think he got his answer when the room laughed.

Now, I would hope that members of the Committee will take into account what the co-sponsors of this text have said. I hope that, in my attempt to provide some courteous reply to questions that have been raised, at what I have said this afternoon will have been heard. I end with the appeal to our colleagues in the Committee to accept our proposal that we defer action on this draft resolution from today until tomorrow; that this be our final decision on this matter and that all have been able to advise their Foreign Ministries immediately — this afternoon, tonight — that action will take place on this text — which has been before the Committee for two weeks and on which there are no further consultations — that action, will take place, by voting, tomorrow. I hope the Committee can accept that proposal of a procedural nature now, and without a vote. Then we can resume our work and take action tomorrow on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: My delegation would like clarification on a few points related to the matter under discussion.

The first concerns document A/C.1/50/2/Rev.1, issued on 27 October 1995, which contains the proposed programme of work and timetable. In it, delegations were informed that action would be taken on all draft resolutions

submitted under agenda items 57 to 81 between Thursday, 9 November, and Monday, 20 November 1995. My delegation would like to believe that all delegations transmitted this proposed programme of work and timetable to their foreign ministries and that therefore those ministries are very well aware that we are now at the decision-making stage, which began last Friday.

Secondly, I wish to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the document circulated by the Chairman on 9 November, which included his suggested programme for the taking of action. In that suggested programme there are 11 clusters. The first cluster relates to nuclear weapons and the first draft resolution in that cluster is A/C.1/50/L.3. The draft resolution was introduced and circulated on 31 October. No revisions have been submitted and no consultations on the draft have taken place. All ministries concerned have known this for two weeks now and this should have provided plenty of time for delegations to receive their instructions.

There is no reason for postponement except to accommodate one delegation. For reasons of courtesy the Committee agreed to defer taking a decision and agreed that instead of voting on it today it would do so tomorrow.

We have been asked why we want to vote on this now. I should like to turn this question around, and ask: what reason is there for waiting? No consultations are taking place. Everyone has, or should have, received instructions. The programme is clear. It is the first draft resolution of the first cluster. What grounds are there for waiting any longer? The only reason we have been given is that yesterday we were told of a supposed decision — which in fact was not taken — and we informed our foreign ministries accordingly. I think it was wrong to bring to the attention of our foreign ministries something that did not take place. We are not at fault on this.

But what other reason could there be for postponing action? Could it be that some delegations think that if action is taken on Friday afternoon there would be no repercussions in the world press since the next day is Saturday? What political purpose is behind this attempt at postponement?

My delegation is ready to vote today. Out of courtesy we agreed to do so tomorrow, but we are ready to vote at any point.

**Mr. Hoffmann** (Germany): I have listened to the debate with great interest because I am a lawyer and it is always nice to be present at a legal fight. I also welcome Ambassador Butler, who is an old United Nations hand in the First Committee, and we like to hear him tell the story of the First Committee.

Apparently, he is one of the more knowledgeable people in the Committee in so far as procedural matters are concerned and therefore he knows full well that in years past we had specific difficulties with some draft resolutions — texts were not ready or, from the political standpoint, we were not ready to vote on them, and so they were deferred to the last minute. The normal time for such draft resolutions to be voted on was the Friday of the last full week — and this is what is happening here.

I must also say that my understanding of what happened yesterday is slightly different from that of the Australian delegation. As far as I am concerned, there was a ruling by the Chairman yesterday that the vote would be deferred to Friday and that decision was accepted.

The German delegation has no problem and is ready to vote on the draft resolution now, and, as the representative of Mexico has pointed out, everybody should have received instructions by now, but not everybody's organization is as orderly as the Mexican State and therefore some of us are not as ready as he is.

I know for a fact that some European delegations simply have not yet been instructed on how to vote. It is our fault of course — the fault of those delegations, but that is the fact and such facts used to be taken into account by the Committee, so I do not quite understand why there is such a hurry. When we accepted the programme of work I remember distinctly that flexibility was built in — that it was decided that if the Chairman receives a request for postponement then the decision should be postponed.

Therefore, as I have stated, my delegation is ready to vote on the draft resolution at any time, but I think we should be courteous as proposed by Mr. de Icaza and wait for those who are not ready to vote and give them a chance to participate in the vote in an orderly fashion.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like briefly to pick up on some points made by the representative of Australia although I would point out that my intention is not to get into a dispute with him. We have listened very attentively to what he has said.

There are two points that I wish to make. The first is that Australia has asserted that this is a matter of great importance to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

I would like to add that I think it is a matter of genuine importance to all delegations here, and therefore the points of view of all delegations should be taken into account, not just those of the sponsors. When I first spoke on this matter, I approached it pragmatically, because, as I said, I do not want to get involved in an argument about whether the decision we had the impression was taken yesterday was right or wrong — or about whether that impression was right or wrong. It was an impression that many delegations shared, and many delegations acted accordingly. In the light of this situation, those delegations have the right to have their views taken into account, although I shall not offer my opinion of whether this was erroneous or not.

Finally, I want to assure my friend the representative of Mexico that the concern not to vote on this draft resolution tomorrow is not a concern of one delegation alone; it is shared by a large number of delegations, which I shall not list now.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I have been listening attentively to the discussion of whether or not the Committee should proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. The Chinese delegation would have no objection to voting right now, because my delegation opposes the draft resolution: it determined its position long ago.

I was pleased to learn that the sponsors are fully prepared for a vote on this draft resolution. But as far as we know, this does not mean that all other countries are equally prepared. Some delegations have probably not yet received instructions from their capitals.

The Chinese delegation hopes that members will recall that all countries are equal, sovereign States, whether or not they are sponsors of this draft resolution. No country has the right to pressure other countries. China does not wish to use the vote as a means of exerting pressure on any other country. Nor does China wish to be pressured itself from any quarter, from any group of countries. China has always considered that there is no point in pressuring anyone: it is always counterproductive.

The debate yesterday and today shows that it would be premature to vote on this draft resolution tomorrow. I consider this draft resolution to be an important one, and it is only normal for countries to want to consider their positions on it. While a country may consider its position to be correct and just, it should not claim that this position has priority: if the position has merit, it will be supported by all. There is nothing to fear in that regard. This is not to say that the majority view is always correct.

**The Chairman:** Since we do not have a great deal of time and since we must deal with a number of draft resolutions this afternoon, I would like to propose that, with the Committee's assent, we deal with this issue right away.

**Mr. Kantola** (Finland): We fully agree with what was said in this context by the representatives of Spain and of Germany. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 is an important one, which is being considered at a high political level. We should show some respect to that fact. I appeal to the sponsors not to insist that the Committee take action on this draft resolution tomorrow.

**Mr. Butler** (Australia): Mr. Chairman, you were about to propose action — which I and the other sponsors support your doing. But in the light of the appeal that has just been made and of other comments that have been made in the past 10 minutes, I would like to say one more thing. The question has been asked of the sponsors, "What is the hurry?". If you ask the wrong question, you get the wrong answer. It is not the right question. We have simply said one thing; it is not a question of whether we are in a hurry or not. We have said that this draft resolution is ready. It is the distinction between something that is ready and something that is not. Therefore, the concept of being in a hurry does not arise.

Under those circumstances, I respectfully submit that the onus of proof is not upon those who are ready, but upon those who want delay.

Finally, it is simply not true that a decision was taken yesterday. A process was started yesterday which would involve further consultation leading to a procedural decision. I have reported, on behalf of the sponsors, on the outcome of that consultation; we now formally propose — we earnestly hope and appeal that we can do this without a procedural vote — that because we are ready we take a decision now to the effect that we will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, 15 November.

**Mr. Vattani** (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): The position of the Italian delegation was set out in the excellent statement by our colleague from Spain.

We are convinced that the vote on such a sensitive draft resolution as that contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 requires that all delegations have time to reflect deeply, that they may convey to this room opinions from their Governments that have been well thought out and that take everyone's considerations into account.

I do not feel that hasty action on this draft resolution would be the best way to proceed. I simply wish to reassure any colleagues who may feel that this request for extra time comes from one delegation alone that the Italian delegation would also be very happy to have more time before we take a decision on this text.

**Mr. Mernier** (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I do not intend to repeat what has been said — and very well said — by our colleagues from Spain and Germany. I simply wish to point out that this text is of particular importance to my delegation and that, whether or not its co-sponsors have thought it through, my delegation has not.

The decision that was adopted yesterday — and we consider that it was indeed adopted yesterday — was communicated to my Government, which is formulating its position with a view to a vote on Friday. We believe that, on such an important issue, we cannot ignore the difficulties that any delegation may be experiencing. We do not feel that there is any hurry nor do we see any grounds for haste.

**The Chairman:** I should like to propose that the representative of the Netherlands be the last speaker in this debate and that we then take action on the proposal made by the representative of Australia. I hope that the Committee will agree to that, because unless we do that we will not be able to finish our work on time. I call on the representative of Djibouti, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

**Mr. Dorani** (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): I apologize for speaking on a point of order, but I must confess that the current atmosphere reminds me of the times of the cold war — and yet, the two blocs no longer exist. There is only one bloc now, and I would say without meaning to be provocative that we are all in the same boat.

Why, then, are we bent on voting on Wednesday when you, Sir, adopted a decision yesterday? I repeat, this was not a proposal on your part, but a decision. Moreover, consultations do not usually take place between the co-sponsors of a text and those delegations most concerned. There is a silent majority that needs to be respected. That majority includes 150 members and discussions go on within it —

**The Chairman:** The representative of Djibouti asked to speak on a point of order and he must make one. But he is making a statement. I will have to ask him to stop speaking unless he wishes to continue on a point of order.

**Mr. Dorani** (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): To conclude, we have faith in your wisdom and skill, Sir. We wish to recall here — and this is my most important point — that a decision was adopted yesterday and no one reacted to that decision that the draft resolution would be put to the vote on Friday.

**Mr. Ramaker** (Netherlands): Like others, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate, not least because my delegation has a particular interest in it. First of all, of course, I entirely agree with what the Spanish Ambassador said on behalf of the European Union when, on two occasions, he stated that it was the Union's desire that you, Sir, would abide by the ruling you made yesterday that we would take action on this particular draft resolution this coming Friday.

The way we have been proceeding in this Committee thus far under your guidance has been very good, I believe. Once the dates were announced in document A/C.1/50/2/Rev.1, page 2 — the dates that were referred to by the Ambassador of Mexico a little while ago — we have tried at each meeting to determine on which draft resolutions we could take action and on which we had yet to wait a little while.

As far as the action on draft resolutions is concerned, in the document that I quote — and that of course is known to my Government — the time period for taking action on the draft resolutions, including the one in document A/C.1/50/L.3, extends from 9 to 20 November. I think that we must take into account that our principals, who indeed attach a great deal of importance to this draft resolution, would have taken this into account when they determined their calendars.

I, like others, would like to inform this Committee that my Government attaches a great deal of importance indeed to this draft resolution. I agree with those who say that we should already have our final instructions, but as sometimes happens with our principals, we do not have final instructions and therefore we, like others, are one of those delegations that would like to appeal to the usual flexibility of this Committee, which has also been applied

to other draft resolutions, that we may simply have this draft resolution — which is among the more difficult ones — placed a little further along in our schedule of work, as is usually done. I think that this is totally normal.

I must say that I have made known bilaterally to the Australian delegation the concern about the practical problems that we face. I am a little bit surprised — and I am sure that The Hague will be surprised — that, in the framework of those friendly relations we have with that country, we now find ourselves on opposite sides of the fence. I understand that, of course, Australia speaks on behalf of a group of delegations. Nevertheless, to that group of delegations I would like to appeal — and my appeal is very much along the lines of what our colleague from Finland has just said — that it show the necessary flexibility in order to allow some of us to face the practical problems that we have.

I do not think there is anything sinister in all of this. All of us will have to make, or have already made, responsible, well-founded decisions on this draft resolution. We think this is a most important issue. For my part, I too would like to appeal for the flexibility that is usual in this Committee on these matters. Yesterday, Sir, I think you sensed that this flexibility was present, and you abided by tradition. And, as far as I know — and it was not to everybody's liking — it was accepted that we would take action on Friday.

I think my delegation and others are making a perfectly reasonable appeal, and do not think that there should be any particular problem with it, given the way this Committee usually works.

**The Chairman:** I appeal again to delegations to refrain from making statements at this stage.

**Mr. Nsanze** (Burundi) *(interpretation from French):* My delegation rarely intervenes and rarely tries to break the monopoly held by other delegations, but the Committee is at a crossroads. We have listened to the divergent positions of other delegations, stated with what approaches intransigence. It will be necessary for all parties to become more flexible with a view to reaching a compromise. While we are aware that the text has been discussed at great length and that the majority of delegations may be ready to take a decision, my delegation is among those that would propose that the vote be deferred. It does not seem right to insist on forcing a position that could lead some delegations to reject the draft resolution before the Committee. All this, plus the team spirit that is supposed to reign in the Committee, would favour deferring action on the draft resolution to a later date — but preferably as close as possible — so that all delegations can receive instructions from their capitals. Given the great importance of the matter, all delegations should have the opportunity to consult their Governments on final, well-thought-out positions.

**The Chairman:** The delegation of Australia has made a specific proposal. The Chair understands that there is a disagreement as to whether action should be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow or on Friday. I propose that we proceed to vote on the proposal made by the representative of Australia.

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I wonder if we could have a reaction to the appeal that has been made by a number of delegations to the sponsors to abide by what has become the practice in this Committee, that we agree on the timing of decisions. We are making a departure from this. I would ask for an answer to that and, while I am about it, an answer to the question that I put earlier: Why all the rush? We have wasted most of the afternoon; why do we not just proceed as originally agreed?

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to suspend the meeting for a few minutes to enable me to consult with other members of the European Union to define our position on this matter.

**The Chairman:** In response to the request by the representative of Spain, I shall now suspend the meeting for a few minutes.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.*

**The Chairman:** After intensive consultations with the delegations concerned, I am happy to report that there is a consensus that the Committee take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 on Thursday afternoon as the first item, at 3 p.m. sharp. If I hear no objection, it is so decided.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** I should like to thank all delegations for their spirit of understanding and cooperation.

At that meeting, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

In cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 and L.39/Rev.1;

In cluster 3: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1;

In cluster 6: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33;

In cluster 7: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1;

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

In cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.18 and L.20/Rev.1.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I see there are none. I shall therefore call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Before we proceed to action, I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1: Cyprus;

A/C.1/50/L.7: Belgium and the United States of America;

A/C.1/50/L.3: Jamaica;

A/C.1/50/L.9: France, India and Mauritius;

A/C.1/50/L.11: Guinea, Mali and Myanmar;

A/C.1/50/L.13: Nicaragua;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Belarus, Cape Verde, Cyprus and Latvia;

A/C.1/50/L.15: Belarus, Cyprus and Kazakstan;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1: Germany;

A/C.1/50/L.16: Islamic Republic of Iran;

A/C.1/50/L.18: Papua New Guinea;

A/C.1/L.19: Malaysia;

A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1: Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/50/L.33: Malaysia and Papua New Guinea;

A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1: Czech Republic, Iceland and Poland;

A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1: Botswana, France, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Sudan and Swaziland;

A/C.1/50/L.38: Bangladesh, Djibouti and New Zealand;

A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1: Malaysia;

A/C.1/50/L.40: Djibouti;

A/C.1/50/L.42: Cyprus and Malaysia; and

A/C.1/50/L.43: Albania, Czech Republic and France.

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions or votes on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that are sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, I wish to make a very slight revision to this draft. In operative paragraph 1, before the words "and the exchange of documents", we wish to introduce the following words: "including the Protocol to that Treaty, signed in Lisbon by the parties on 23 May 1992".

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and the following countries that are associating themselves with it — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland and

Romania and Slovakia. For the first time this year, all the States members of the European Union will be abstaining on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The European Union continues to attach importance to negative security assurances, but we take the view that its support cannot be given to a text that simply repeats General Assembly resolution 49/73 with only a few small changes. Many significant developments that were favourably welcomed by the European Union have taken place in the area covered by this agenda item. The Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 984 (1995), and declarations were made by the nuclear-weapon States concerning both negative and positive security assurances.

At the Review and Extension Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) held last May, the States parties to the NPT agreed, without a vote, that further steps should be considered to assure non-nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Those steps could take the form of an internationally binding legal instrument.

The draft resolution also fails to make any mention of the need for reciprocal commitments concerning non-proliferation on the part of the recipients of the security assurances. This important development takes on particular significance from the standpoint of the indefinite extension of the NPT.

**The Chairman**: Would there be any other delegation wishing to speak at this stage?

If there are none, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested. Also a separate recorded vote on preambular paragraph 7 has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will take action first on the separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation and the United States of America. It is sponsored by the following States: Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey and the United States of America.

The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 116 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Viet Nam.

The Committee will now proceed to take action by recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala,

Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Swaziland

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Swaziland advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain on the draft resolution.]

**The Chairman:** As the Committee may recall, yesterday the Committee agreed to take up also draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 but thereafter the Chair received a request to defer action on this draft resolution to a later date. I understand that the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.44 wish to take this draft resolution at this meeting. May I inquire from the co-sponsors of the draft resolution whether this is the case.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: It was indicated yesterday that action would be taken today on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.44. For this reason we assumed that, just as the Committee voted today on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, so it would vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, which deals with the same matter.

**The Chairman:** Is the Committee ready to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44?

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States delegation is not ready to vote on this draft resolution. A short time ago you, Mr. Chairman, ruled that we would take only draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.39 from cluster 1. My delegation heard a proposed amendment just about 10 minutes ago, and we too are thinking about proposing an amendment. In these circumstances we should very much like to have more time for consultations.

**The Chairman:** Does the representative of Colombia agree that, since an oral amendment has been proposed, there is a need for further consultations with a view to arriving at consensus on the draft resolution?

**Mr. García** (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: In fact, our amendment was presented orally for the specific purpose of saving the Committee's time and to enable us to take action on this draft resolution as soon as possible. However, if it is felt that more time is required — if one delegation feels that the decision should be put off until tomorrow — we have no objection to that course, bearing in mind the fact that an amendment has been proposed orally.

**The Chairman:** I thank the representative of Colombia for his cooperation. Action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 will be taken tomorrow.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

**Mr. Starr** (Australia): I should like to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, on security assurances.

The delegation of Australia is a serious and consistent advocate of the pursuit of more satisfactory and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. My delegation has been active in the pursuit of

this high-priority goal. We chaired productive discussions on the subject at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which took place earlier this year. We have also put forward our own concrete ideas and proposals.

Because of this serious-minded commitment to an objective that we believe is worthwhile and attainable, my delegation has for the last three years joined Canada and New Zealand in urging on the States that are traditionally the joint sponsors of this draft resolution a number of fundamental changes that are required to reflect reality. Australia's support for what we regarded as an increasingly deficient text was subject to the understanding that some effort would be made in the following year to address our concerns. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

My delegation has repeatedly stressed the necessary link between security assurances and acceptance by the beneficiary States of unambiguous and internationally verified nuclear-non-proliferation commitments. It is not reasonable for any State to expect to benefit from security assurances if it is not itself willing to contribute to ensuring the nuclear security of others by subscribing to the international non-proliferation regime.

As I noted last year, the overwhelming majority of States have displayed such commitment by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or to regional non-proliferation accords of comparable scope, or to both. There is no doubt as to the nuclear reassurance that they have extended to others. They are demonstrably and verifiably non-nuclear-weapon States.

My Government therefore finds it disappointing that sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39 were apparently unable to accept even a cross-reference to the contribution made to enhanced international security by the continuing strict adherence of non-nuclear-weapon States to multilateral and legally binding non-proliferation undertakings that are verified by full-scope nuclear safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

More important, we find it deeply troubling that, apparently, even the barest of cross-references to important, relevant outcomes of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference could not be considered for inclusion. We view the agreement struck by the 175 States participating in the Review and Extension Conference, and subscribed to by all five nuclear-weapon States — agreement that was recorded in the Conference's decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament — as an important milestone. That agreement states that further steps should be considered to assure non-nuclear-weapon States party to the Treaty against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, it being recognized that such steps could take the form of an internationally legally binding instrument.

For ourselves — indeed, we believe, for all but a handful of the States represented in this room — these are important undertakings. We wish to see them given the prominence that they warrant, for we firmly expect them to be the basis of determined action by the nuclear-weapon States in the future.

Because of the resistance to the inclusion of such fundamental points, Australia's decision to continue its support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1 was made most reluctantly. We appeal to the sponsors to amend their approach next year so that it will accord with the new situation in which we find ourselves and with the commitments and aspirations of the vast majority of delegations represented here.

**Mr. Deimundo** (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The delegation of Argentina wishes to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, which the Committee has just adopted.

Argentina's position on this draft resolution derives from the fact that it does not sufficiently reflect the headway that has been made in this area over the years. I am thinking in particular of the second decision taken at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and of Security Council resolution 984 (1995), which was adopted unanimously.

The declaration subscribed to by the nuclear-weapon States is regarded as a very positive step. All such measures help directly to strengthen security in the international community, and they underscore the fact that we are entering into a genuine process of nuclear disarmament.

Because of the wording of the text, Argentina was unable to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): My delegation joined those that were abstaining in respect of the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1. I do not suppose that anyone was surprised at our abstention.

Our views on the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) have been stated several times already during this session of the General Assembly, and I do not intend to repeat those views. However, I can say that we do not view with appreciation the indefinite extension of the NPT.

Our abstention on the draft resolution as a whole was necessitated by the fact that while we recognize and welcome the steps that are being taken by the nuclear-weapon States towards disarmament, we feel that the situation is not quite as bright as is portrayed here. We do feel that there is a need for the nuclear-weapon States to move even more purposefully towards the goal of ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons and that we as non-nuclear-weapon States should be aware of what exactly is going on.

I would like to make a very brief comment on some of the comments made both before and after the vote on A/C.1/50/L.39. My delegation has noted with great interest that non-nuclear-weapon States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will now, according to the reasoning put forward both by the delegations of Spain and Australia, look after their own defence.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. We understand the desire of States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Nuclear Weapons that are non-nuclear-weapon States to have definite assurances of the non-use of any nuclear weapons against them. Unfortunately, the draft resolution on this subject does not take sufficient account of the positive significance of the measures already undertaken along these lines and of the important contribution to the strengthening of international security made by the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 984 (1995) of 11 April 1995, which guarantees the security of non-nuclear States. Nor does it take sufficient account of the agreed statement of the nuclear-weapon States on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States participating in the NPT. In this context, an important step was taken towards agreeing on a common approach on the part of nuclear-weapon States on this issue. Russia, as well as other nuclear-weapon States, feels that guarantees have to be provided to non-nuclear States that are parties to the NPT. This will possibly provide for future agreement: on the one hand, the international legal obligation not to possess nuclear weapons, and on the other hand, the assurances on non-use. These are the most important elements and they have been omitted from draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. Therefore, it is hard to imagine how this kind of resolution can serve to promote progress towards a solution to the specific problem at the Conference on Disarmament. At the same time, we would like to confirm our support for the working out of legally binding security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT and for the renewal to that end of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament.

**The Chairman**: Owing to the lateness of the hour, the Committee will have to continue its work tomorrow. The Chair will call on the rest of the speakers tomorrow morning. As you may very well recall, we still have a number of draft resolutions that were supposed to have been taken up this afternoon. Those draft resolutions will be taken up as the first order of business tomorrow.

May we now go through the other draft resolutions in the various clusters on which we may also take action tomorrow morning.

In cluster 1, we will take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, which was introduced by Colombia on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, we wish very particularly to request the Chair to include that draft resolution for action tomorrow.

**The Chairman**: Yes, of course. Actually, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 figures as the first item for tomorrow morning.

In cluster 2, I wonder whether the Committee would be ready to take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1. I see no objections, so we will also take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

In cluster 4, we can take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40 tomorrow. I see no objections.

In cluster 8, we could take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.27, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.48 tomorrow morning. As there appears to be no objection, it is so agreed.

**Mr. Moher** (Canada): This is not to raise questions about draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48, but draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 deals with the same subject-matter. We had requested that when A/C.1/50/L.48 came up for action, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 would also come forward. I am not saying this to disagree: I am merely suggesting that this one be added.

**The Chairman:** May we include A/C.1/50/L.13?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** We turn now to draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.23 and A/C.1/50/L.25 in cluster 11. If I hear no objection, we will take action on A/C.1/50/L.23 and A/C.1/50/L.25 tomorrow morning.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** I have been informed by the Secretariat that we can take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 only if the programme budget implications are ready. It seems that they are not ready and that they may not be ready tomorrow. Therefore it will not be possible to take up that draft resolution tomorrow.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I thought that we had asked whether, with the agreement of the lead co-sponsor, it would be possible to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): We have the same point.

**Mr. Goosen** (South Africa): We wanted to speak to make the same point as the representative of the United Kingdom. It had also been our understanding that this draft resolution would be considered towards the end.

**The Chairman:** Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23 will therefore be taken up at a later stage.

**Mr. Than** (Myanmar): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, the revised text will be published tomorrow. Because of the 24-hour rule, it will be proper to allow one day, I believe. I would therefore suggest that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 be taken up on Thursday.

**The Chairman:** I think that this is a reasonable suggestion. We will therefore not take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 tomorrow.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I understand that we have, of course, several draft resolutions left over that we were supposed to act on today. Would it be possible for the Secretariat to give us a list of all the draft resolutions on which we will be taking action tomorrow?

**The Chairman:** Tomorrow morning we are going to take up the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1; in cluster 2: A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40 —

**Mr. Ramaker** (Netherlands): While I support the request made by the Ambassador of Pakistan to give us a list, I did understand that we would first finish the business that was left over this afternoon and that we would then go on with the list you have been reading, Sir. You are now mixing the clusters. I think it would be easier if you could give us the chronological order and then the others.

**The Chairman:** That would be fine. In cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 6: A/C.1/50/L.33; in cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1; in cluster 8: A/C.1/50/L.12; in cluster 10: A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30; and in cluster 11: A/C.1/50/L.18 and A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1.

Then, in cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1; in cluster 2: A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.34 —

I should like to ask representatives whether the Committee would be ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34?

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would be grateful if a decision on that particular draft resolution could be deferred to Thursday to allow for some consultations with its co-sponsors.

**The Chairman:** It is so agreed.

In cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40; in cluster 8: A/C.1/50/L.27, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.13 and A/C.1/50/L.48 —

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I wonder if it would be possible for the delegation of Colombia to agree to take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1 on Thursday. I do not think that my delegation will be in a position to vote on it tomorrow. I would be very grateful if that could be done.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: We would be prepared to have this draft resolution taken up on Thursday.

**The Chairman**: It is so agreed.

**Mr. Abdel Aziz** (Egypt): It seems to me that when we first checked the draft resolutions, we decided that we would also decide on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 in cluster 1 tomorrow. Is that correct or was there another decision?

**The Chairman**: The representative of Myanmar has proposed that since the revision will be issued tomorrow, it would be appropriate for the Committee to allow time for consideration by delegations.

**Mr. Laptsenak** (Belarus) *(interpretation from Russian)*: I asked to speak earlier when we were discussing the order in which draft resolutions would be considered tomorrow. I should like some clarification.

As I understood it, it was proposed that we would take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1 tomorrow. As far as I know, the text of this draft resolution has an additional amendment. It is our understanding that it will appear in A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2. Is that correct?

**The Chairman**: Yes, there will be a Rev.2. We have already agreed which draft resolutions will be taken up tomorrow.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*

United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.21

# General Assembly
Fiftieth session

Official Records

## First Committee
**21**st Meeting
Wednesday, 15 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

*Chairman:* Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

*The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.*

**Agenda items 57 to 81** *(continued)*

**Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items**

**The Chairman:** I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.12: Paraguay;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Cape Verde, Cyprus and Latvia;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand and Norway;

A/C.1/50/L.31: Australia and Brunei Darussalam;

A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1: Bhutan, El Salvador and Guatemala;

A/C.1/50/L.45: Djibouti, Liechtenstein and Tunisia;

A/C.1/50/L.48: the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia; and

A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: Australia, the Marshall Islands and Monaco.

**The Chairman:** As representatives may recall, last night we were not able to finish the list of speakers. The first order of business today will be for delegations to continue to speak in explanation of vote or position after the vote on cluster 1.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): Pakistan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, on "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

Although we appreciate the progress that has been made in the bilateral nuclear negotiations between the United States and the Russian Federation, we felt that the draft resolution was deficient in two respects. In its seventh preambular paragraph, the General Assembly would express appreciation of the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Pakistan is not a party to the NPT. In any event, the indefinite extension has been questioned, even by some parties to the NPT.

Secondly, we feel that the progress in nuclear disarmament made in negotiations held outside the single multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament, should be reported to the Conference, which should be responsible for negotiating a phased programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

While I am speaking, may I take this opportunity to respond briefly to the statements made yesterday by the representative of the European Union and Australia, explaining their votes on the draft resolution on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1.

95-86666 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

It was stated by the representative of the European Union that this draft resolution did not reflect the latest developments. We believe that this is not a correct evaluation. The draft resolution notes Security Council resolution 984 (1995) as well as the views expressed on it.

The paragraphs relating to the results of the NPT Conference were discussed by my delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, with the delegation of Australia. It is unfortunate that our dialogue was left incomplete by the other side. This has now been used as justification for abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution.

We must state at this moment that we cannot accept the proposition that security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be made conditional on their acceptance of the NPT or other non-proliferation treaties. It is our view, which we have consistently expressed, that the nuclear-weapon States have an obligation to provide security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States because of their possession of nuclear weapons —

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): I apologize to the representative of Pakistan, but under rule 128 of the rules of procedure, I believe that it is improper for you, Sir, to allow explanations of votes by proposers of resolutions.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I wish that the representative of the United States had heard what I was saying a little more clearly than he evidently did. I concluded my remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 and then stated that I wished to respond to the statements made by the European Union and Australia. I have the right to reply to a statement that was made in this discussion and I am exercising that right. I would urge representatives to exercise some self-restraint in hearing the positions of other delegations with which, perhaps, they do not agree.

As I was saying, it is our view that the nuclear-weapon States have an obligation to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons. This obligation flows from the very possession of nuclear weapons because, we believe, weapons of mass destruction should be prohibited.

Many members of the European Union have, for many years, enjoyed the assurances of one or more nuclear-weapon States under their alliance arrangements. These assurances were provided them even before the NPT was formulated or came into force. They were not illegal because of that. They flowed from Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

As regards our friends from Australia, there was a long period of time before Australia ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We wonder whether Australia felt that, during this period when it was not a party to the NPT, it was legitimate for nuclear-weapon States to hold out the threat of nuclear weapons against Australia.

All those who have spoken along these lines should ponder very carefully the consequences of the proposition that security assurances should be restricted to those States that are parties to the NPT.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): The Egyptian delegation would like to explain why it abstained in the vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1. Egypt abstained on that paragraph because the word "Appreciating" with which it begins is not consonant with the letter of the statement delivered by the delegation of Egypt on the adoption of the decision in question at last May's Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

**Mr. Sukontasap** (Thailand): I wish to explain Thailand's vote yesterday afternoon on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". My delegation wishes to place on record that Thailand has no objection to the overall idea of that draft resolution. However, we felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, as we believe that it does not adequately reflect the sentiment of the international community on this important subject. We believe that the majority of States would wish to see a time-bound framework for the elimination of the nuclear threat, and that the Conference on Disarmament should be allowed to play a greater role in nuclear disarmament negotiations.

**Mr. Jusuf** (Indonesia): I wish to explain the Indonesian delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". While we agree with the general thrust of the text, we note that wording to the effect that the primary responsibility rests with the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those which possess the largest stockpiles, is conspicuous by its absence. Members

may recall that this notion was explicitly reflected both in resolution 49/75 L, sponsored by the Non-Aligned Movement and adopted by consensus, and in resolution 49/75 P, sponsored by the United States, the Russian Federation and a number of other States, both of which we strongly supported.

Its omission in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 is thus inexplicable, to say the least, for it stands to reason and is logical that only States possessing nuclear weapons must bear the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament; this must be emphasized.

I turn now to the fourth preambular paragraph, which stresses the importance of strengthening international peace and security through general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. While we recognize the significance of this concept and approach, the absence in this paragraph of a reference to the need to achieve nuclear disarmament as the immediate and overriding goal detracts from the spirit of the draft resolution. It is also incompatible with the determined view of an overwhelming majority of the international community in their quest for a world without the menace of nuclear weapons.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I had intended to respond to the statement of the representative of Pakistan, who seemed to think that the fact that he had spoken to the Australian Ambassador would automatically satisfy the members of the European Union. I should have thought that the events of yesterday would have shown that that was not always the case. But I believe that the representative of Spain wishes to respond on behalf of the European Union, and I very happily leave it to him to do so.

**Mr. Starr** (Australia): I am not sure under which rule I am responding, but this is certainly a question of right of reply. I did not think we were in rights of reply and explanations of vote, but that seems to be the case. Let me say immediately that I am delighted that my statement following the vote was listened to so carefully by a number of countries at which it was aimed. That is an extremely pleasing result.

Australia deeply regrets that some countries have not seen fit to commit themselves to binding non-proliferation commitments. We believe that such commitments are an essential and understandable requirement if we are going to see a global arrangement for full security assurances. May I also say that references to early years of the NPT's existence, a period more than 20 years ago, have little relevance to a situation now, with a regime commanding such international support that it is, I would argue, almost at the stage of becoming customary international law. Certainly, the provisions of the NPT are so widely accepted that they constitute a norm of international behaviour that those few countries that have not joined yet should well consider.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to reply on behalf of the European Union to the observations made by the representative of Pakistan in his statement yesterday. Let me note the undeniable fact that my statement was made with a specific date in mind: 14 November 1995. Therefore, we should not make references to a time in the past, to a time when the circumstances were very different from the present ones. Today's international community and international problems are very different from those of several years ago. The moment in history at which my statement was made is the present, a time at which the international community must address the basic problem of avoiding the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The best way to do this is through signature of the non-proliferation Treaty.

My delegation, on behalf of the countries of the European Union, stated its view yesterday that reference to that fact was lacking in the draft resolution.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, since you have ruled — curiously, in my view — that rights of reply are permitted during the voting and not at the end of the proceedings, I should like a brief right of reply to the representative of Pakistan.

I would simply say that careful reading of Security Council resolution 984 (1995) will show that it is the clear and precise policy of all five nuclear-weapon States that security assurances extended by those nuclear-weapon States reciprocate, and correspond to, the undertakings of the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to renounce nuclear weapons and place their nuclear capabilities and programmes under international safeguards. Now if Pakistan and India would like to have the assurances that are extended by the five nuclear-weapon States, the way is clear.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): Since the representative of the United States has entered this dialogue, I should like briefly to respond to his remarks.

First of all, it is our view, and we believe that this view is supported by customary international law, that the possession of nuclear weapons is an aberration. Which law gives the five nuclear-weapon States the right to hold nuclear weapons in perpetuity? There is no such law. The very first resolution of the United Nations declared that nuclear weapons are weapon of mass destruction and should be prohibited. Therefore, it is the aberration of the possession of nuclear weapons by five States which must be rectified. And until that is rectified through nuclear disarmament and the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, these five States have an obligation — I repeat, they have an obligation — to assure the rest of us that they will not use these weapons against any of us.

The representative of the United States has said that their security assurances reciprocate obligations undertaken under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Does this mean that the United States holds out the threat of the use of nuclear weapons against those non-nuclear weapon States that are not parties to the NPT? This would be inconsistent with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Charter says that the use of force, or the threat of use of force, by any means, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, is illegal. Therefore, the use, or threat of use of nuclear weapons *per se* is illegal, and it is against this threat that there must be security assurances. These security assurances must be provided to all non-nuclear-weapon States.

To ask us to accept the NPT as a condition higher to those security assurances amounts, I would submit, to nuclear blackmail.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like to take this opportunity to state the Chinese position on Security Council resolution 984 (1995).

China has consistently maintained that we should extend unconditional assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States on the use, or threat of use, in any circumstances and at any time, of nuclear weapons against them. These non-nuclear-weapon States, of course, include States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is precisely on the basis of this reasoning that China joined the other four nuclear-weapon States in proposing Security Council resolution 984 (1995).

**Mr. Starr** (Australia): I hesitate to intervene again. Let me make clear where Australia comes from. Our Foreign Minister has argued in The Hague, before the International Court of Justice, that if the Court decides to reach a decision on cases before it regarding nuclear weapons, it accepts that nuclear weapons are illegal. Possession, acquisition, use — illegal.

But I cannot leave unanswered the comments by my colleague from Pakistan. Let me put a question to him: Does the lack of commitment to non-proliferation on the part of his country represent a threat of possible acquisition of nuclear weapons to other States? I would also put to him, and to others, that the question of commitments does not require a State to join a particular Treaty; there are other ways for a State to express its commitment to non-proliferation.

In our statements, we have never made mandatory the sense that a State has to join a particular regime or not. What we are most concerned with is the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the fact that there be no further nuclear-weapon States, and that the nuclear weapons at present in existence be subject to a systematic programme of reduction towards their ultimate elimination so that we can achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world.

**The Chairman:** May I now appeal now to delegations. We devoted the first part of this morning's meeting to the continuation of last night's debate. I did not want to separate the explanation of vote or position after the vote from the rights of reply, only because I did not want to waste time. I simply wanted to gain some time and finish with the responses. We have already had a number of requests from various delegations, and I hope that they will keep their statements very short.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I have asked to speak only because the representative of Australia has addressed a direct question to me, and I should like to respond to him. I appreciate the spirit in which he has made those comments, and we appreciate Australia's position with regard to the illegality of nuclear weapons.

First of all, the fact that certain countries are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) can arise from their peculiar circumstances. Australia knows full well the circumstances that Pakistan faces, and also knows the efforts we have made for non-proliferation in our region. Pakistan is therefore not apologetic about its position on non-proliferation. We have a consistent stand in favour of non-proliferation, but there are special reasons why we

have not ratified the NPT. But I submit to him that the self-restraint that has been exercised by my country is a fact, because we have not acted otherwise. We have accepted unilateral commitments on non-proliferation, and we have acted on those commitments.

Those commitments, I submit, should not be dismissed lightly by certain States and used to put pressure on us by various means. That is not a contribution to non-proliferation. We should work together to address non-proliferation problems in various parts of the world, taking account of the particular situations in those regions. You cannot paint all the problems of the world with a broad brush.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1; in cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 6, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33; in cluster 7, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1; in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12; in cluster 10, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30; and in cluster 11, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. Action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 in cluster 11 must be deferred, as the statement of its financial implications is not yet ready.

After concluding its action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2; in cluster 2, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, to which I shall return in a moment; in cluster 4, draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and L.40; and in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

The sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.13 and L.48 have asked the Chairman to defer action on those draft resolutions; with the consent of the Committee, action on those two draft resolutions will be deferred to a later date.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, the Secretariat informs me that the draft resolution has programme budget implications; the relevant document will be available tomorrow morning. But it is my understanding that the draft resolution will not involve financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): It was my understanding that we had agreed yesterday that the Committee would not take action today on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2. Is this not correct?

**The Chairman:** It was the understanding of the Chair that we would indeed be taking up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 this morning, but if delegations are not ready to take action on that draft resolution, we could, with the consent of the sponsor, defer it.

**Mr. Bandura** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would request that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 be taken tomorrow morning as the first item of the day.

**The Chairman:** I propose, then, with the consent of the Committee, to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 until tomorrow.

**Mr. Boros** (Hungary): You have just informed the Committee, Sir, that you have information from the Secretariat that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 is without financial implications. My delegation is among the sponsors of this draft resolution. As this was among the first draft resolution to be submitted, some three weeks ago, I propose that action be taken on the draft resolution today, as had been decided yesterday.

**The Chairman:** I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): As you stated, Sir, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 has no implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. However, in a case such as this one, we would in certain circumstances read out a statement on the financial aspects of the text. In this instance, the Budget Division has seen fit to submit a document, which will be issued tomorrow as document A/C.1/50/L.59. I shall read out selected portions of that note by the Secretariat, and will try to refer to the relevant points.

> "2. The requests contained in operative paragraphs 3 and 5 are related to major programme 1, Maintenance of peace and security, disarmament and decolonization, programme 7, Disarmament, of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997, as revised. They are covered under section 2, Political affairs, subprogramme 1, Deliberation and negotiation, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.

"3. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services would be required for its implementation.

"4. In addition, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, no modifications would be required in the activities under section 2, Political affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997 as the activities to be undertaken under the draft resolution fall under programme 7, Disarmament, subprogramme 1, Deliberation and negotiation, activity 1, International cooperation, (a) depositary services." (*A/C.1/50/L.59, paras. 2, 3 and 4*)

With respect to assistance and services, I would point out that there are two major categories. The first is conference servicing costs, which amount to a total of $2,843,700 for the Fourth Review Conference and $176,300 for the Preparatory Committee.

As far as the non-conference services are concerned, there are two major aspects here: first, travel and daily subsistence allowance for three professionals and one general service staff from the Centre for Disarmament Affairs which would amount to $28,700 for the Fourth Review Conference and $15,200 for the Preparatory Committee. And secondly, one work month of temporary assistance will also be required, which would result in the expenditure of $4,200 for the Fourth Review Conference itself and, according to these figures, the grand total of those costs falling under conference-servicing and non-conference-servicing costs would amount to $2,876,600 for the Fourth Review Conference on Biological Weapons and $191,500 for the Preparatory Committee.

I will not read the entire text but I wish to refer to one or two more paragraphs.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 to provide the necessary assistance and required services for the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference ... [and] the Special Conference, has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the conference of the Convention". ...

The "conference of the Convention" refers to the States parties. The reference is, of course, to the Special Conference on Biological Weapons and the Preparatory Committee.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions and treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance. It should be noted that costings are being provided for indicative purposes only and that the States parties to the Convention will have to bear the actual costs of holding the Conference and its Preparatory Committee meeting, which may be somewhat lower or higher than the estimated costs.

"Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997." (*A/C.1/50/L.59, paras. 7-9*)

All the details will appear in document A/C.1/50/L.59, to be issued tomorrow.

**The Chairman:** We have a proposal from the representative of Hungary to take action on the draft resolution today. If I hear no objection I will put the draft resolution to the vote today.

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Ukraine to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2.

**Mr. Bandura** (Ukraine) *(interpretation from Russian)*: My delegation is speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament" — namely Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Marshall Islands, Monaco and Ukraine.

I should like briefly to explain the reasons for the submission of this draft resolution. Over the last few years, the First Committee has adopted a number of consensus resolutions in which States have been called upon to make their contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament and to associate themselves with the various agreements and treaties which have been concluded in this area.

Following the principles contained in the proposal of the First Committee and approved by the General Assembly, and recognizing their responsibility for building a future of peace based on the absence of weapons of mass destruction, it was decided to confer non-nuclear status on States which had never possessed nuclear technology and which had voluntarily liquidated their nuclear programmes or had renounced the possession of nuclear weapons which they inherited after their proclamations of independence. Those States have all taken an important step towards achieving a nuclear-free world. In the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution, such actions must be properly reflected in the decision of such an important body as the United Nations. This is the basic idea underlying the draft resolution.

Recognizing the difficulties involved in nuclear problems and the interests of individual groups and States the sponsors of the draft resolution did everything possible to avoid controversial conceptual formulations. The draft resolution just notes facts and avoids any evaluation of decisions that have been taken.

In the first preambular paragraph reference is made to last year's resolutions in which States were called upon to continue their efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, adhering to and ratifying the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and adopting two important treaties in regard to nuclear disarmament — START I and START II.

Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution lists States which acceded to the NPT after the First Committee concluded its work last year. In paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 the Assembly would take note of the entry into force and implementation of START I and would welcome as major achievements in the sphere of nuclear disarmament the signing of the START II Treaty by the Russian Federation and the United States. In operational paragraph 5, the Assembly would welcome States which had voluntarily renounced their nuclear programmes and nuclear weapons and were thus making a significant contribution to disarmament and the strengthening of regional and global security.

As for my own country, the draft resolution simply welcomes the accession to the NPT of Ukraine — which at the time it proclaimed its independence, possessed the third largest nuclear potential, voluntarily gave it up, and also undertook to liquidate more than 1500 warheads which had belonged to the Russian Federation.

Thus, the draft resolution, which is really of a procedural nature, notes the implementation of the requirements set forth last year in two consensus resolutions and one adopted by an overwhelming majority with only one abstention. One of these resolutions was adopted y non-aligned countries, one by developed countries and the third by a country which had suffered from nuclear destruction.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50, though submitted by a country that often has a different policy in regard to disarmament, meets the requirements for adoption by consensus and we appeal to States to adopt it unanimously. Adopting this decision will, in our view, testify to the readiness of members of the First Committee to implement decisions already adopted and to their commitment to do so and will give our work a new forward-looking momentum.

Inasmuch as the revised text of the draft resolution — A/C.1/0/L.50/Rev.1 — was circulated only this morning and inasmuch as it contains certain drafting changes, we would like to give countries an opportunity to acquaint themselves with it and we would once again request the Chair to defer the adoption of a decision on the draft resolution to tomorrow morning as one of the items in the cluster on nuclear matters.

**The Chairman:** If there no other draft resolutions to be introduced I shall now call upon representatives wishing to make statements other than in explanation of vote.

I see there are none.

I shall therefore now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States will vote against on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". That draft resolution is an attempt to distort the historic result of the recent Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We all know that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 is a counter-draft to the Russian Federation-United States draft resolution on

bilateral nuclear arms negotiations — resolution A/C.1/50/L.35 — which was adopted yesterday by an overwhelming majority.

However, there are many significant differences between draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35 and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44. As opposed to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35, the draft resolution we are about to take action on avoids mentioning in any way the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and its sponsors refuse to welcome the accession to the NPT of Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine. How is it possible for this United Nations body, responsible for disarmament, not to welcome those accessions to the NPT?

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 purposely avoids any of the consensus language from the NPT decision on "Principles and Objectives". Language on general and complete disarmament is missing, and language on nuclear disarmament is rewritten and distorted to suit some non-NPT States.

Finally, there are parts of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 that are patently untrue. For example, in the eighth preambular paragraph it is claimed that the nuclear-weapon States have expressed determination to pursue systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons within a time-bound framework. I can assure you that the nuclear-weapon States have not said this. Where do those words come from? How they found their way into the Cartagena Final Document is not our business, but they are not words that were ever accepted and endorsed by the nuclear-weapon States.

We regret that this session of the First Committee is more contentious than recent past sessions. A vivid example is this case of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.44. The question before us, in our view, is whether an effort led by a small minority of non-NPT States should be permitted to distort, in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44; the results of the NPT Review and Extension Conference. The response of the United States delegation will be "No", and we urge all other NPT Parties to join us in pushing the red button on this draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995.

**The Chairman:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakstan, Liechtenstein,

Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Tajikistan, Ukraine

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to 37, with 22 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation notes with regret that this year once again it has not been possible to adopt a single draft resolution on bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament by consensus, a subject of great importance to us, for quite understandable reasons.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, basing themselves on the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation and the United States of America, along with other countries, have omitted a number of important points, particular those relating to the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the accession to it of Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakstan as non-nuclear-weapon States.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 also includes provisions that are not in keeping with the agreement achieved at the Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and, moreover, even distorts the provisions of that agreement. For example, the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8 both reflect no more than wishful thinking on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution. On that basis, it is difficult to build a realistic policy in this important matter.

For all those reasons we were compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1.

**Mr. Starr** (Australia): Australia regrets that it was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, on "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". Australia is firmly committed to a systematic process of nuclear disarmament, leading to the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons. We believe the strategic environment is such that a continued programme of balanced reductions in nuclear arsenals that takes into account the need for stable deterrence in the transitional period can now be realistically pursued.

We fully support the resolution's focus on the need for determined pursuit of the objective of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons through a systematic process. However, we were disappointed that a draft resolution dealing with so important a topic failed to make any explicit reference to a development of undeniable significance to the subject of the draft resolution, namely, the outcome of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The only reference to the commitments taken by the nuclear-weapon States at that Conference is an implicit and inaccurate one, in the eighth preambular paragraph. In our view, the neglect of reference to the NPT, which provides the only legal framework in which all five nuclear-weapon States are bound to the process of nuclear disarmament, renders the draft resolution unbalanced.

**Mr. Richards** (New Zealand): New Zealand also abstained on the text contained in document A/C.1/50/L.44 on bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament. It is well known that New Zealand supports such bilateral negotiations and has nuclear disarmament as one of its main aims in the matter of arms control. The best way to achieve these goals is by working towards consensus within the international community by taking proper account of major achievements accomplished on the way towards the desired aim.

New Zealand is disappointed that there have been two draft resolutions on this subject. It is unfortunate that the sponsors of the text that we have just voted on failed to take the opportunity that was available to them to support and co-sponsor a consensus measure that would have reflected the common aspirations of the international community.

At the same time, we very much regret that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 took no account of one of the year's major achievements in further extending controls on nuclear weapons, that is to say, the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is, in our view, unhelpful to survey what has been done and make recommendations about the future without reference to such an important step. With that decision, the parties to the Treaty — the overwhelming majority of the United Nations — made permanent the international community's rejection of nuclear weapons by accepting, as an ultimate goal, the complete elimination of such weapons.

My delegation also finds it unhelpful to suggest that the goals we all desire, including the one I have just mentioned, need be approached by the device of time-

bound frameworks. Time-lines are appropriate where a goal, or a step on the way to a goal, is attainable, and a spur is needed, but otherwise, they do not help the cause and may indeed make progress more difficult. There is no magic wand that can wave away, whether according to a time-bound framework or not, the problems we are all trying to overcome. There is no quick fix. Progress is made by hard, cooperative work, sometimes faster, sometimes slower, but always seeking a further positive step on the way and taking account of steps achieved. It is because this text lacked attention to such things that New Zealand recorded an abstention.

**Ms. Kurokochi** (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44.

Japan, with its unique experience, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause indescribable human suffering, should never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.44 encourages and supports the Russian Federation and the United States to give their nuclear disarmament efforts the highest priority in order to contribute to the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

My delegation understands that this draft resolution is not the product of coordination of the views of these two nuclear-weapon States. Japan, which seeks to promote nuclear disarmament by means of steady disarmament efforts, cannot regard the draft resolution as having been formulated on the basis of appropriate consideration and consultation, and therefore could not support it.

**The Chairman:** Before we move on the next draft resolution, I wish to inform the Committee that there is a possibility of continuing our meeting this afternoon. Conference services will be available. In case the First Committee is not able to finish with those draft resolutions on which we are supposed to take action today, we may have to convene another meeting this afternoon. Certainly it will be done with the consent of the Committee. Does the Committee agree to that procedure?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** I turn now to cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their vote or position on the draft resolutions contained in that cluster.

**Mr. Neagu** (Romania): The draft resolutions on conventional weapons reveal an increased preoccupation on the part of Member States with the excessive accumulation, use and traffic — both legal and illegal — of such weapons. The overall number of co-sponsors of these draft resolutions is impressive, covering practically all regions of the world. The required actions go from mere confidence-building measures to restrictions and even prohibitions on the use of certain conventional weapons, measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, and assistance to States affected by such illicit traffic to curb such illegal actions and collect illegally transferred arms.

The draft resolutions submitted for adoption refer to heavy and expensive weapons such as battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large-calibre artillery systems, attack helicopters, combat aircraft, warships, missiles and missile systems, as well as to small, light, and frequently cheap, arms, including anti-personnel land-mines that might cost only $3 to $7 each.

Romania is proud to have co-sponsored from the very outset the draft resolutions on transparency in armaments. My delegation subscribes fully to the statement of the Netherlands delegation — introducing the text in question — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 — in the Committee this year as well. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which is the subject of this draft resolution, constitutes, as is underlined in the second paragraph of the preamble, an important step forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters. The report of the Secretary-General on the Register provides data on seven important categories of arms, as well as background information received from Member States, on a voluntary basis, regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures.

The returns provided by some 90 countries cover more than 90 per cent of the international weapons trade. We consider, however, that even those countries that do not export or import arms should make a "nil" report to indicate their commitment to the reporting mechanism.

Romania has consistently provided the required data, and it supports the inclusion, as mandatory returns, of data on military holdings and procurement through national

production. This will make the Register more complete and more useful.

We also join those who consider that, after several years, it is necessary to make an evaluation. We look forward to the report to be provided by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of experts to be convened in 1997 — as requested in the draft resolution — on the continued operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Members States and the Secretary-General's 1994 report on the subject, with a view to a decision at the fifty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly.

I call on all delegations to vote for this draft resolution.

My delegation is also a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.34 and A/C.1/50/L.45 regarding prohibitions or restrictions on, respectively, the use of certain conventional weapons and a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines. We welcome the adoption, by the recent Vienna Review Conference of the parties to the 1981 Convention on certain conventional weapons, of a new Protocol on blinding lasers. We hope that, at its resumed session next January, the Conference will be able to adopt an amended Protocol II significantly reducing the dangers caused by the indiscriminate use of land-mines, and contributing to the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines.

We hope that both of these draft resolutions will be adopted without a vote.

Romania is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, on small arms, which was initiated by Japan and was so ably introduced by Ambassador Kurokochi. We also support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37, on measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29, on assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them.

Romania strictly respects all arms embargoes established by the United Nations Security Council, and it has taken all possible measures to prevent illegal exports of arms and military material.

Indeed, the excessive accumulation of small arms, as well as their chaotic — albeit illicit — transfer, is an aggravating factor in regional conflicts, creating tension in times of peace. But no particular measures have yet been taken to combat such negative developments in the international arena. As is rightly stated in the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, arms obtained though the illicit arms trade are most likely to be used for violent purposes, and even small arms, when obtained, directly or indirectly, by terrorist groups, drug traffickers or underground organizations, can pose a danger to regional and international security, and certainly to the security and political stability of the countries affected.

A study prepared by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of qualified governmental experts, will be of great value, helping us to identify principles and criteria to be followed by States in considering international transfers of small and other conventional arms, as well as ways and means of preventing or reducing the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of such arms, taking particular account of the way in which they cause or exacerbate conflict.

My delegation noted with interest the proposal of the International Committee of the Red Cross that small-arms transfers be reflected in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Romania hopes to collaborate further with the numerous countries sponsoring these draft resolutions on conventional weapons — indeed, with all States Members of the United Nations — in order to promote and realize the noble and constructive objective of the proposals that they contain. In this sense, we consider that some work can be done both at the Conference on Disarmament — in the Ad Hoc Committee on Transparency in Armaments — and at the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

I call on delegations to support all these draft resolutions.

**The Chairman:** Does any other delegation wish to make a statement? Apparently not.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

**Mr. Volski** (Georgia): Georgia is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, which is entitled "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms".

Like many other States, Georgia has itself felt the destructive force of evil that conventional weapons are

capable of inflicting when they are at the disposal of extremist forces and terrorists.

**The Chairman:** I apologize to the representative of Georgia for having to point out that, under the rules of procedure, a sponsor of a draft resolution is not allowed to explain its vote on that draft resolution. A sponsoring delegation is supposed to make its statement at the "statement" stage of the debate on the cluster.

**Mr. Volski** (Georgia): I approached the Secretariat with regard to this matter, and my name was included in the list. When I heard you call me, Mr. Chairman, I was obliged to speak.

**The Chairman:** Very well. I shall call on the representative of Georgia, not for an explanation of vote but for a general statement on cluster 3.

**Mr. Volski** (Georgia): Like many other States, Georgia has itself felt the destructive force of evil that conventional weapons are capable of inflicting when they are at the disposal of extremist forces and terrorists. Great material damage has been inflicted on many States. To recover from such damage and overcome the consequences of this evil, a State requires great financial resources.

My Government calls upon all States to act responsibly by supporting this draft resolution. In making this call, it is joining the many people whose lives have been blighted by injury and those who are still being maimed by the war. We believe that it is very important that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

**The Chairman:** Does any other delegation wish to make a statement?

**Mr. Goonetilleke** (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka is among those that have co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, on measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms.

Sri Lanka, in this forum and elsewhere, has taken a consistent stand on the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, the practice of which has been on the increase, with devastating consequences for the national security of States in all parts of the world, particularly small and vulnerable countries. The situation has been aggravated in recent years by the availability of huge quantities of conventional weapons, released by the end of the cold war. A disturbing development in this respect is the impact of activities of this nature on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States affected.

Another area of serious concern to my delegation is the increasing tendency to recruit, either by force or through enticement, child soldiers, sometimes as young as 10 years of age, equip them with illicitly obtained weapons and use them to wage secessionist wars and conduct terrorist activities, in total disregard of the interests of such children. The seriousness of the situation compelled the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka to raise this issue at the current session of the General Assembly.

In view of this situation, my delegation fully shares the views expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1 and expresses the hope that it will be adopted by the First Committee and the General Assembly with the widest possible majority.

My delegation also hopes that, pursuant to operative paragraph 3, Member States would take follow-up action by expressing their views concerning measures at national, regional and international levels to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons.

**The Chairman:** We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): I shall be extremely brief. I should like just to read out the names of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Afghanistan at the 16th meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Bhutan, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Turkmenistan and Zimbabwe.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am making this statement on behalf of the European Union and also of the following countries: Argentina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. The member States of the European Union joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, in view of their general support for measures to curb the illicit traffic in, and use of, conventional arms.

With respect to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the member States of the European Union wish to affirm that they adhere strictly to all the arms embargoes that have been imposed by the Security Council and the European Union, and that they are adopting all possible measures to prevent the illicit export of arms and military *materiel*.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now move on to cluster 6.

We will take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.33.

I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am making this statement on behalf of the European Union and the following countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union to explain to the Committee why the members of the Union will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33.

This change from a positive vote to an abstention on the text as a whole is explained by the fact that the draft resolution submitted to our Committee this year is practically the same as the resolutions on the subject adopted over the last two years, though the arms race in outer space ceased to exist when the cold war ended. The members of the European Union believe that henceforth it is indispensable to change the draft resolution substantially, since we can no longer consider that it reflects the current international situation by insisting as it does on positions which cannot, as experience has shown, receive widespread support from the international community.

In the opinion of the European Union, the draft resolution should be considerably abridged and made to focus essentially on the one element that can be sure of the support of the international community with regard to the military use of space, namely, the negotiation of confidence-building measures in space. The European Union has every confidence that the traditional sponsors of the draft resolution will in the future take into account the need to modify the text so that it can attract broader support from the international community on a subject the importance of which is recognized by all.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, curiously entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". We will abstain for several reasons, the most important of which is the language in operative paragraph 8, in which the Conference on Disarmament is requested to prepare for negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement to prevent an arms race in outer space.

We have previously pointed out that there is no arms race in outer space today. This positive circumstance can be attributed to the legal agreements already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Consequently, the negotiation of any additional agreements is not required. Accordingly, the United States does not agree with the fifteenth preambular paragraph or with operative paragraph 8 regarding negotiations on measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, nor do we agree with the statement in the nineteenth preambular paragraph that the fundamental task of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate such an agreement.

In addition, because of changes in the global security environment, and since there is no arms race, there is no foundation for the claim in the seventh preambular paragraph that it represents a grave danger for international peace and security.

Finally, I would like to note in passing that the twelfth preambular paragraph incorrectly indicates that an Ad Hoc Committee continued the examination and identification of various issues, and so on. The fact is that there was no such Ad Hoc Committee in 1995.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the nineteenth paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraphs 8 and 10.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Ukraine.

The Committee will first vote on the nineteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*The nineteenth paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 99 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33.

A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South

Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 100 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.*

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 91 votes to 1, with 63 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, as a whole, was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 46 abstentions.*

**The Chairman:** I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", as a whole. In our view, the most promising area of activity for the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space remains the production of concrete proposals on confidence-building and better information on the part of those carrying out activities in outer space.

In that connection, the Ad Hoc Committee has received studies and proposals from various countries. We should point out, however, that the draft resolution submitted at this session does not fully reflect the realities of today's world. We do not, therefore, consider it timely to urge my country and the United States of America to resume their bilateral negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement for preventing an arms race in outer space, negotiations which in the past resulted in the START I Agreement, as does operative paragraph 10. The Russian delegation was therefore compelled to abstain in the separate vote on that paragraph.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, in cluster 7.

I call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Amran** (Malaysia): My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to explain its position prior to the Committee's taking action on the important item before us today on the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

We truly appreciate the initiative taken by the delegation of South Africa and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 in bringing once again to the Committee's attention this important issue, one that is of particular interest to my delegation and to many others here as well. My delegation supports this draft resolution.

At the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in 1978, we agreed to establish the Conference on Disarmament. Since then, the Conference on Disarmament has been the single, most-important, global disarmament negotiating forum committed to promoting general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

However, since its establishment the Conference has been a kind of exclusive club of only a few Member States. For two consecutive sessions, in resolutions 48/77 B of 16 December 1993 and 49/77 B of 15 December 1994, we urged the Conference on Disarmament to make every effort to reach a solution resulting in a significant expansion of its composition, which would then include at least sixty countries.

We were, however, disappointed that when the Conference decided at its 719th plenary meeting on 21 September 1995 to review its membership, it extended membership to only 23 countries out of 35 that had applied. Even those 23 countries have yet to assume their membership until the Conference decides on a date.

Malaysia has a particular interest in becoming a member of this important subsidiary organ of the United Nations. Malaysia applied for membership in the Conference on Disarmament on 2 September 1993. Given our significant interest in and strong commitment to playing an active role in the international community's efforts towards international peace and security, and in particular its efforts to promote general and complete disarmament, my delegation strongly urges that Malaysia's application, together with those of the other candidates to date, should be given serious consideration by the Conference on Disarmament as a matter of the highest priority.

Membership in the Conference on Disarmament is, we believe, the legitimate aspiration of all applicants that have already expressed their desire to join it. We strongly urge the Conference on Disarmament to consider, on an urgent basis, the remaining candidates to date, and we are very hopeful that that will result in an early and positive decision.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their position.

**Mr. Ledogar** (United States of America): The United States was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 regarding expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. The United States is a long-time supporter of expanding the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, dating back to the early 1980s. While the Conference on Disarmament has failed many times in the past to find consensus to expand its membership, we continue to believe that the time is right to make the composition of the Conference on Disarmament more reflective of the changing international environment. In operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 the Conference on Disarmament is urged, at the start of its 1996 session, to implement the decision contained in document CD/1356.

I would like to remind colleagues that the United States stands ready to implement CD/1356 as soon as possible. We can take a decision in the Conference on Disarmament when we return to Geneva at the end of this month or early in December, or we could take a decision early in January before the 1996 session of the Conference on Disarmament even begins. In this regard, the United States reiterates its proposal of 21 September contained in document CD/1362, which states that all those on the O'Sullivan list can assume together membership of the Conference as long as the Conference, at the same time, decides that any State member of the Conference on Disarmament which is subject to comprehensive enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter would not have the right to deny consensus on any decision otherwise acceptable to all other members of the Conference. The United States welcomes the support that our proposal has received from many in the Conference on Disarmament and we would point out that the proposal contained in our document CD/1362 is the only one before us which could implement promptly the September decision to admit all those States on the O'Sullivan list.

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation has long been of the firm view, taking into account various points and arguments about the issue, that the Conference on Disarmament can benefit from expansion of its membership. We agree also with arguments and reasons cited in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 in favour of expansion of the membership. Indeed, there are a number of countries that can and, I am sure, will continue to contribute to the work of the Conference usefully and substantially through such expansion. In the light of this, we agreed to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 here and we shall continue to support in earnest and promote the expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament and endeavour to seek the best possible way to achieve this. We wish to stress in this

regard, and in regard to the decision of the Conference, whose implementation is urged in operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, that there exists a real possibility for expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament by the time it begins its work in 1996. This requires examination of those proposals submitted at the Conference on Disarmament or other possible future proposals which provide a reasonable approach that permits the expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament immediately and specifically at the start of the 1996 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan was happy to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1. We have long favoured the balanced expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament to better reflect the realities of the current world. We very much regret that the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to approve the so-called O'Sullivan list for the past two years, owing unfortunately to the position taken by one delegation. We agree with the statement in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution that the Conference on Disarmament should implement its decision contained in document CD/1356 on an urgent basis. We hope that this can happen when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes in January 1996. I must state, however, that it is the position of my delegation and, we understand, of several others, that no conditions or arbitrary limitations should be imposed on sovereign States.

**The Chairman**: Would there be any other delegation wishing to explain its vote? There seems to be none. ...

I call on the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

**Mr. Kim** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I just want to know something. It is a different question. We originally co-sponsored the draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 but there was no mention here of our country. I want to know why.

**The Chairman**: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for a clarification.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Apparently the name was omitted inadvertently and, of course, with the Committee's concurrence, it will be reinstated.

**The Chairman**: In view of the lateness of the hour, we will have to continue our work this afternoon at 3 p.m., as we agreed.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.22

# General Assembly
Fiftieth session

*Official Records*

## First Committee
**22**nd Meeting
Wednesday, 15 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

*Chairman:* Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.*

**Agenda items 57 to 81** *(continued)*

**Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items**

**The Chairman:** This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items. As I announced at the meeting this morning, the Committee will proceed at this meeting to take a decision on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30;

In cluster 11: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18;

In cluster 2: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2;

In cluster 4: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40; and

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

We will also take up, in cluster 2, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, as the Committee decided this morning.

I now call on the representative of Ukraine.

**Mr. Bandura** (Ukraine) *(interpretation from Russian)*: Did I understand you correctly? We asked for deferment of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 to tomorrow morning.

**The Chairman:** You are quite right. Yes, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 will be taken up tomorrow.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 8, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.3: San Marino;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Belarus;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2: Australia, Italy, Spain and Sweden;

A/C.1/50/L.43: Slovak Republic;

A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1: South Africa;

A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: Belarus.

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make a statement — not explanations of vote or positions — before the voting. Are there any representatives wishing to speak?

95-86678 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

There seem to be none.

Are there any representatives wishing to explain their vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 in cluster 8?

I call on the representative of the United States of America for an explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Madden** (United States of America): The position of the United States of America on the importance of verification and arms control and disarmament has been frequently demonstrated and is well known. The United States was unable, however, to support the initiation of the study to which this draft resolution refers, because we found it premature, and the proposed items of reference inappropriate.

The study went ahead nevertheless. After reviewing the conclusions and recommendations of the now-completed study, the United States cannot endorse them either. We simply cannot support implementation of recommendations that we do not agree with on such an important subject. The United States has repeatedly urged the sponsors of this draft resolution to submit a strictly procedural resolution along traditional lines, and was prepared to join in a consensus on such a procedural text. Unfortunately, the draft resolution before us presumes that the recommendations contained in this study are broadly supported and are to be implemented by the Secretary-General. In the draft resolution Member States are encouraged to assist him in this endeavour — at least on occasion. Furthermore, in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.2 the Secretary-General is asked to report to the General Assembly on actions taken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat with respect to those recommendations.

The United States finds itself compelled, therefore, to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

**The Chairman:** Are there any other representatives wishing to speak at this stage? There seem to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, in cluster 8.

A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 15th meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kazakstan, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Georgia, Germany, Israel, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Papua New Guinea and Trinidad and Tobago advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.]

**The Chairman:** I call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote.

**Sir Michael Weston** (United Kingdom): I have asked to speak to explain my delegation's abstention on the draft resolution that the Committee has just adopted, the text of which was contained in document A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

My delegation abstained along with the rest of the European Union on resolution 48/68 of 16 December 1993, in which the General Assembly called on the Secretary-General to undertake an in-depth study on the verification issues identified in that resolution. We did so because we saw no need for such a study. We believed that commissioning one was not a good use of valuable United Nations resources and we considered that some of the terms of reference for the study were frankly meaningless. As the resolution was adopted, the study went ahead. We had hoped that the co-sponsors of the current resolution would submit a purely procedural text, taking note of the study and inviting the view of Member States.

The original draft we saw was far from procedural. It contained a number of substantive paragraphs with clear financial implications. Indeed, my delegation would probably have had to vote against that draft. We are grateful to the co-sponsors, in particular to the lead sponsor, Canada, for the spirit in which they received our suggestions and tried to deal with our problems. The draft resolution in the form in which it was submitted had been amended in a way that met most of our concerns. If it had not been put to the vote, we would indeed have been prepared to join consensus on the understanding that endorsement of the draft resolution in no way implied endorsement of the recommendations in the study, some of which run counter to our views, in particular, to our view that verification measures should be treaty specific on the matter for States parties to particular treaties. As, however, there was a request for a vote, my delegation considered that its position could more accurately be reflected by an abstention.

**Mr. Kim Chang Guk** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I am going to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 — mainly a loose report of the Secretary-General — makes mention of nuclear issues. The nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula is a political and military one, to be settled solely by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the United States of America, since it was initiated by the United States, which introduced nuclear weapons into South Korea, resorted to nuclear threats against us, and created suspicion of our secret nuclear weapons programme.

It is not a question to be debated in the United Nations. In the past, the United Nations intervention created complexity rather than assisting with the settlement of the nuclear issue. The report of the Secretary-General was again an intentional attempt to turn away from the substance and nature of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly commends the report of the Secretary-General, which is not helpful to the settlement of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula. My delegation therefore abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

**Mrs. Bourgois** (France) *(interpretation from French)*: The French delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". Its abstention is prompted by reasons of form and substance.

First of all, France abstained in the voting on draft resolution 48/68 and spoke out against paragraph 2 of the operative part, in which the Secretary-General was requested to carry out a further study on verification with the assistance of governmental experts.

Secondly, the study prepared by that Group of Experts, in which my country did not participate, produced conclusions and recommendations that are not in keeping

with our position in regard to verification of disarmament agreements; in particular — with respect to the principle of specificity — the verification regimes pursuant to disarmament treaties and arrangements concerned. My delegation further believes that the draft resolution, despite the remarkable efforts of the Canadian delegation, cannot be interpreted in its final version as a purely procedural text. In operative paragraph 3, for example, States are encouraged to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the Group of Experts, but above all they are called upon to assist the Secretary-General in implementing them.

Furthermore, in paragraph 4 the Secretary-General is requested to report to the General Assembly on actions taken with respect to the recommendations of the Group of Experts.

For all these reasons, France decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, in the light of the reservations it has about the content of the study by the Group of Experts.

**Mr. Hasan** (Iraq) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: My delegation lost its right to vote in the General Assembly in accordance with Article 19 of the Charter because we fell behind in our contributions, in view of the sanctions imposed on Iraq and the freezing of Iraqi assets. Had we still had the right to vote, we would have voiced reservations on the draft resolution, particularly, on the paragraph that has to do with Iraq in the report of the Group of Experts. This paragraph has been foisted into the subject of the report and it contains inaccurate conclusions.

**The Chairman:** If there are no other delegations wishing to speak, may the Committee then proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft texts in cluster 10. We shall take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

I shall now call on those delegations who wish to make statements other than explanations of vote or position.

**Mr. Chaves** (Kyrgyzstan): The delegation of Kyrgyzstan supports these drafts and hopes that they will be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Laptsenak** (Belarus) *(interpretation from Russian)*: I wish to inform the Committee that the Republic of Belarus has decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

**The Chairman:** Note is taken of the fact that Belarus has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

As it seems that there are no further statements, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

**Mr. Moniz** (Portugal): Portugal will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan.

This draft resolution deserves our most careful attention. We consider neutrality as a right that is inherent in the sovereignty of every State. In our view, the permanent, constructive neutrality of Turkmenistan would contribute to the promotion of peace, stability and security, not only in that region but on a more global scale.

Portugal supports this decision of Turkmenistan and believes that it should be followed by constructive dialogue on security with all the countries in the region. This dialogue should address the multiple legal and international implications. We are convinced that this process will be possible only through cooperation at the regional level. We therefore encourage such cooperation.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan too expresses its full support for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.9 and hopes that it will be adopted by consensus.

At the risk of being considered out of order, I want to say that Pakistan would like to join the sponsors of this draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** It has been noted that Pakistan wishes to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

**Mr. Osman** (Afghanistan): As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, Afghanistan believes that every State has a legitimate right to determine its own policy. Turkmenistan's adoption of a policy of permanent neutrality would greatly enhance peace and stability in its own region and in other countries.

Afghanistan firmly supports the draft resolution and recommends to all other delegations that it be adopted by consensus.

**The Chairman:** I remind delegations once again that sponsors of a draft resolution should not explain their vote on that draft. They are, of course, entitled to make statements at the appropriate stage.

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish simply to join those who have expressed support for this draft resolution. As one of its sponsors, we too wish to see it adopted by consensus.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan", was introduced by the representative of Turkmenistan at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Georgia, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Mauritius, France and India.

**The Chairman:** If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/50/L.30, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The draft decision contained in document A/C.1/50/L.30, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995.

The Committee will proceed to take a recorded vote on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30 was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 52 abstentions.*

**The Chairman**: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.30.

As I see that no delegation wishes to explain its vote, we will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 in cluster 11. A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution. Separate recorded votes have also been requested on operative paragraph 3 *(b)* and operative paragraph 5.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of Netherlands at the 14th meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States — and I should preface my remarks by saying that the list is a long one: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 entitled "Transparency in armaments", I have to put on record the following statement of financial implications:

"By paragraphs 1, 3, 4 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, the General Assembly would:

'Reaffirm its determination to ensure the effective operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as provided for in paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 46/36 L' [operative paragraph 1];

'Reaffirm its decision, with a view to further development of the Register, to keep the scope of and participation in the Register under review, and, to that end:

'(a) Recall its request to Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and on transparency measures related to weapons of mass destruction;

'(b) Recall its request to the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 1997, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the 1994 report of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to a decision at its fifty-second session;' [operative paragraph 3]

'Request the Secretary-General to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register;' [operative paragraph 4]

'Request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-first session on the progress made in implementing the present resolution;' [operative paragraph 7]

"In that connection, the activities called for in operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 4 of the draft resolution are programmed in the proposed programme budget for the 1996-97 biennium under Section 2 C.4, Disarmament. It appears under sub-programme 3, 'Monitoring Analysis and Studies' of Programme 7, 'Disarmament', of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-97.

"Provisions have therefore been made in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-97

(A/50/6 (Section 2)) which would enable the Centre for Disarmament Affairs to provide appropriate substantive support services to the three sessions of the group of governmental experts to be held in New York in 1997. In addition, resources have been proposed to be made available to the group for three work-months of consultancy services. The consultant would be required to have extensive knowledge and expertise on defence-related technologies, arms transfer problems and transparency. The consultant would prepare the successive drafts of the group's report and would attend the sessions of the group. Activities to be carried out would also concentrate on *(a)* operating and maintaining the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

"Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, its implementation would not require additional resources to undertake the activities requested in operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 4 of the draft resolution, as provision has been made the same in the 1996-1997 proposed programme budget."

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to read this statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

The Committee will now proceed to take action by a recorded vote, first on operative paragraph 3 *(b)* of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan

*Operative paragraph 3 (b) was retained by 133 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain on operative paragraph 3 *(b)*.]

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Voting will now commence on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan

*Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 133 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Lebanon advised the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the vote on operative paragraph 5.]

**The Chairman:** I call on the Committee Secretary.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole.

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

**Mr. Sulaiman** (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I have asked to speak to explain my position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

**The Chairman:** May I ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to speak after the decision has been taken because we are already in the process of voting. We did not have any speakers inscribed on the list before the vote. I apologize if there was some mistake on the part of the Secretariat.

I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

**Mr. Sulaiman** (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I asked to speak before adopting a position with regard to the draft resolution, but I did not do it before the meeting.

**The Chairman:** I would like, as I said before, to call on you after the decision has been taken on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue his conduct of the voting.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Argentina advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Lebanon had intended not to participate.]

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

I call on the representative of Israel.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): I would like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, on transparency in armaments, by which Israel was among the first countries to support resolution 46/36 L, by which the General Assembly established the Register. It was also among the first to send in its report, in accordance with the resolution, and has continued to do so annually. The Register is certainly important as the beginning of a long process in the implementation of global confidence-building measures. However, it still needs to stand up to the test of time and the principle of stability should be kept.

Therefore, Israel believes that the existing categories of the Register should be consolidated before further major changes are considered. In this context, Israel does not support the references made in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to "military holdings" and to "procurement through national production", nor to the reference in operative paragraph 3 *(a)* to "weapons of mass destruction". We believe that additional countries from our region should participate in the Register. We further hold that the establishment of confidence and security building measures in the regional framework of the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security will significantly improve the confidence and transparency in our region.

**Mr. Mesdoua** (Algeria) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation regrets that, this year again, it was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 because we note, with regret, that there has not been any real progress in the matter of transparency, to which my country attaches particular importance. Moreover, we could not support the text because of the approach contemplated, which continues to give pride of place to the treatment of transparency by frameworks defined in paragraphs 3 *(b)* and 5 of the operative part. In our view these have shown their limitations because they have not yielded the anticipated results for a number of countries, including my own.

My delegation, which supports any effort to establish systems of transparency that are viable, effective and integrated, cannot sanction the pursuit of an initiative which has not lived up to our expectations.

For all these reasons, my delegation did not participate in the vote on paragraphs 3 *(b)* and 5, and it abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole. However, we remain confident that the co-sponsors will in the future take into account the positions taken so that this question can be the subject of consensus at the next session.

**Mr. Mubarak** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I should like to explain my country's position on the draft resolution on transparency in armament in document A/C.1/50/L.18.

My delegation has abstained from voting, as it did last year, because the draft resolution just adopted contained nothing new with regard to transparency. The draft resolution, focused, as did the resolution adopted last year, on the Register of Conventional Arms as if it were an end in itself. To consider the Register an important stage on the road to transparency, as stated in the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 6 of the draft resolution does not reflect, in the view of my country, the full concept of transparency.

The Register's scope with regard to conventional weapons does not go beyond imports and exports of such weapons and unless it is expanded to encompass domestic production and stockpiles of those weapons, the Register will remain a form without content. Furthermore, the draft resolution does not underscore the relationship between conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

This is an important consideration to which my country accords a high priority particularly in the Middle East region, where the Israelis' possession of stockpiles of highly advanced sophisticated conventional weapons side by side with nuclear weapons poses a definite threat to peace and security in the region.

In this regard, mention must be made of yet another consideration that has to do with transparency: namely the monopoly of the nuclear Powers of the purchase, possession and transfer of nuclear materials. In document A/50/320 , distributed under item 70 which relates to the issue of transparency, we drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that the United States has purchased and transferred from the Republic of Kazakstan 600 kilogrammes of radioactive uranium ready for use in nuclear-weapons manufacture. The uranium was stored in United States nuclear facilities. This conduct on the part of a super-Power does not only breach the non-proliferation treaty (NPT) but also poses a threat to the peace and security of other States, as neither the Security Council nor the International Atomic Energy Agency has been advised of the action taken by the United States with regard to those 600 kilogrammes of this material: whether they will be destroyed or used, and what guarantees are there that they will not be exported to another country as is required by non-proliferation principles. Failing this, any other state will be entitled to acquire and store any quantity of uranium it deems sufficient for its needs in order to break the monopoly of such materials.

Proceeding from this, we abstained from voting on the draft resolution relating to transparency as it did not include the positive measures that would reflect in actual practice the desired purpose of transparency in the field of all categories of armaments, especially with regard to the weapons of mass destruction.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, which we have just adopted, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Our reasons are as follows:

Concerning paragraph 3 (*b*), we believe that 1997 will be too soon for us to carry out a serious and in-depth evaluation of the functioning of the Register of Conventional Arms and to take decisions on its further development.

As to paragraph 5, the wording might be taken to suggest that the Conference on Disarmament should continue its work in the field of transparency in accordance with its earlier mandate, which has lapsed. We are not against having the item on transparency considered by the Conference on Disarmament, provided that the scope of its new mandate be defined clearly and on a joint basis. It was for the same reasons that my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution as a whole.

I have just explained my vote, but as long as I am speaking I wish to make a brief comment, almost a point of order though I hesitate to call it such. It is kindly directed at the Secretariat.

Our Secretary, with the characteristic efficiency and diligence for which we are all grateful, locks and unlocks the voting machine with admirable celerity, undoubtedly to save the Committee's valuable and expensive time. A pause of a few seconds between the end of the automatic counting and the announcement of the locking of the voting machine might also help to save time.

**The Chairman:** The Chair will certainly bear that in mind.

**Mr. Kim Chang Guk** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

First of all, my delegation would like to ask whether the Register of Conventional Arms is really helpful to confidence- building and disarmament. Transparency should serve disarmament and not exist for its own sake. The arms-exporting countries are now scrambling for domination of the world's arms market. In particular, certain arms-exporting countries are transferring a large amount of weapons to regions in conflict in pursuit of their own political purposes.

The arms Register cannot influence arms transfers at all, because arms-exporting countries are all big and powerful and arms transfers are conducted for their political and economic benefit. Arms transfer serves the arms trade rather than helping confidence- building and disarmament. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

**Mr. Rivero Rosario** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's position on the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 on which we voted separately.

In the case of paragraph 3 (b), our delegation abstained in the voting because we feel that 1997 is rather too soon to establish a group of governmental experts to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development. We expressed the same view last year.

We should take into account, on the one hand, the fact that the Register has been in operation for only three years. It is a very young confidence-building measure. More time is needed to see how it develops and to extend its scope. On the other hand, a meeting of the group of experts was held in 1994 to consider the same subjects, and as far as we could see from the report it produced there is no agreement in the opinion of Member States and of the experts, a common basis for consensus on the questions that require it. We therefore believe that another report is a bit premature, and for that reason we abstained in the voting on that paragraph.

We also abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 5 because we felt that work in the field of transparency in armaments in the Conference on Disarmament had been concluded. In our view, this is not an appropriate time to add any further work to the Conference's schedule on a subject that is not of high priority as regards negotiations, and we therefore also abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

**Miss Wahbi** (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My Government abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". We did so because of certain specific elements it contains.

Sudan does not oppose transparency in armaments. On the contrary, we consider it to be a very important and necessary matter. Transparency, however, should be applied with some specificity. It should be comprehensive and fair. In this respect, we wish to state that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is insufficient and that it should be supplemented by a register of weapons of mass destruction, which are more dangerous and have much more serious implications for mankind than do conventional weapons.

On the other hand, we believe that the information submitted to the Register is usually inaccurate and incomplete. For example, no information is provided by the exporting countries or by the importers of weapons for use by some rebel secessionist movements and mercenary groups while such weapons, as is well known, are used to destabilize certain States and to overthrow their legitimate Governments.

For all these reasons, Sudan has been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution as its reservations have not been taken into consideration.

**Mr. Sulaiman** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". My delegation affirms its full support for the international tendency to build an international society free from the threat or use of force and in which the principles of peace and justice would prevail.

While confirming our readiness to participate in any international effort aimed in good faith at achieving that goal, we wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the draft resolution "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the special situation that exists in the Middle East region, where the Arab-Israeli conflict continues because of Israel's persistence in occupying Arab lands, its refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions, its continued possession of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons of mass destruction and its ability to produce the most sophisticated of weapons and to stockpile them in the region.Therefore, transparency in Israel's armaments is non-existent save for a glimpse at the tip of the iceberg.

For all those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. I hope that the record will show that my delegation had wished to make a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): I would like to explain India's several votes on the separate paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 and the draft resolution as a whole.

We have accepted the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as a global confidence-building measure and have contributed to it regularly. However, we are of the view that perhaps the time has come to consolidate work on the Register and to get more countries to participate in it. We abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b) and on the draft resolution as a whole because the last Group of Experts, which met recently, agreed that no further development was required at the present moment. We therefore doubt the efficacy of convening yet another group of experts in 1997 to address the very same issue.

We are not against having the Conference on Disarmament consider transparency in armaments, although we do feel that the wording of operative paragraph 5 might have been somewhat tighter. Since we are not against having the Conference on Disarmament discuss transparency, however, we voted in favour of that particular paragraph.

The overall reservations we have on the main thrust of the draft resolution led us to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

**Mr. Jusuf** (Indonesia): I asked to speak to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". Indonesia can go along with the thrust of the draft resolution. We note, however, that operative paragraph 3 (b) contains elements on which my delegation has doubts, namely, the establishment of a group of governmental experts to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account work of the Conference on Disarmament. Similar attempts in the past have failed to produce concrete results.

Furthermore, we do not believe that it is appropriate for the Conference on Disarmament to embark upon such an exercise, as it is invited to do in operative paragraph 5, owing to the need for it to concentrate on the highest priority in its agenda, namely, the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In short, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b), operative paragraph 5 and the draft resolution as a whole.

**Mr. Nasseri** (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation is in favour of the content of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole and believes that transparency in armaments and the ideas and issues raised in this context are important and deserve consideration and follow-up. We are cognizant of the contributions that an enhanced level of transparency could make in building confidence among States and that it would help to improve the security of States.

Measures in this regard may be particularly helpful in our region. In that light, the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided information to the United Nations Register and is looking forward to seeing others do the same.

We would therefore have liked to be in a position to support the draft resolution. However, owing to some difficulties in relation to operative paragraph 3 (b), including the reference to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and specifically, the manner in which that work should be treated, we could not give our support for the draft resolution in our vote at this time.

The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, can be invited to consider continuing the work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments. The result of that work, however, should be presented to the General Assembly for the United Nations Members to consider and to take note of. The Conference on Disarmament does not deal with an issue only in order that its work can be taken into account by a group of governmental experts who then make their own conclusions in the form of a report by the United Nations Secretary-General.

Experts or a group of experts may be invited to assist the Conference on Disarmament in its deliberations on an issue. This has been the case on various occasions in the past. The Conference on Disarmament may also decide to present the result of its work on a specific issue through the United Nations Secretary-General. Reversing that order, however, as seems to be the case in operative paragraph 3, would create structural problems.

We hope to address that problem within the Conference on Disarmament and in future consultations on this issue. For the moment, however, we have had to settle for an abstention.

**Mr. Hasan** (Iraq): I asked to speak to explain the position of my country on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. Had we had the right to vote, we would have abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

**Mr. Sha Zukang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 and voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

China has always believed that proper and feasible measures on transparency in armaments are conducive to enhancing confidence-building and reducing tension among States. China has participated in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms ever since it was established. China believes that since political, military and security conditions vary from country to county, transparency-related measures cannot fail to take into consideration the actual conditions of the countries

concerned and of their regions. They can only be set forth and implemented on a voluntary basis.

China believes that the Register is a relatively new element. Some time and experience are needed to sum up its pros and cons. The primary issue at present is to enhance the universality of the Register. Rushing to expand it is not necessarily beneficial.

As to whether the Conference on Disarmament should continue the work it has undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments, the Chinese delegation believes that this should be considered in a balanced manner by the Conference on Disarmament itself in conjunction with all aspects of its work. There is no need to reach a premature conclusion in this regard.

The Chinese delegation believes that transparency should not be sought for its own sake. The important thing is how to keep offensive weapons from being shipped in large quantities into areas of tension and conflict and truly put an end to the practice of undermining the sovereignty of other countries and interfering with their internal affairs through the transfer of armaments.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): Pakistan has reservations on what we call the supply-side approach to conventional arms control. We have, however, joined in participating in the Register, and we hope that the Register will become universal.

It is our feeling, however, that the group of experts that met last year has exhausted its mandate, and we feel that some time should be allowed to elapse before a panel of experts should be convened again to consider the future development of the Register. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b).

Similarly, with regard to operative paragraph 5, we abstained in the voting on that paragraph because we feel that the Conference on Disarmament is not the most appropriate forum in which to take up the issue of transparency in armaments, a measure that is at best a confidence-building measure of limited value to conventional arms control and disarmament.

Nevertheless, Pakistan supports the broad objectives of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and we have therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

**Mr. Issa** (Egypt): I should like to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments".

Intensive negotiations took place in the First Committee in 1991 on the text of the draft resolution which later became General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "Transparency in armaments". It is no secret that at that time there were already significant divergent views on the substance of the draft resolution. Egypt stressed the need for certain basic requirements to be fulfilled if the Register were to become a truly significant confidence-building measure and thereby contribute to enhancing security and stability. Those requirements were that it must be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure, that it ensure equal rights and obligations for all States, that it address the legitimate security concerns of all States and, finally, that it provide the broadest degree of transparency in all fields of armaments in a non-selective manner. These requirements have yet to be fulfilled.

The modest steps taken to establish the Register in 1991 were then recognized and accepted as a practical necessity since the evolutionary nature of this mechanism was abundantly clear from resolution 46/36 L. There was also a prescribed time-frame for that evolution to be completed, that being completion of the work of the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts which was mandated to undertake this task.

The Group, as we are well aware, failed to reach agreement on any aspect related to further expansion of the Register. This failure to reach agreement on the development of the scope of the Register or on the expansion of the scope of the Register to include information on stockpiles and indigenous production capabilities, or on the incorporation in the Register of weapons of mass destruction, was clear testimony to the lack of political will on the part of some members of the international community to embrace meaningfully the principle of transparency.

It is our view that emphasis should not be focused on simply attracting the widest-possible participation in the Register but rather on ensuring true transparency. It is our sincere hope that the prospects for the eventual development of the Register in terms of the expansion of its scope will become less remote and that the political will which was lacking in 1994 will eventually materialize in 1997 into a willingness to embrace faithfully the principles

and objectives of transparency and apply them in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that Egypt shall continue to be supportive of applying the principles of transparency to all fields of disarmament in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner that will serve to guarantee equally the security interests of all Member States and ultimately lead us to a mechanism that would ensure transparency in armaments, as was envisioned in resolution 46/36 L, rather than a Register of selective and limited conventional arms transfers, which is what we have today.

**Mr. Hamdan** (Lebanon): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation believes that the draft resolution falls short of providing full transparency in the field of armaments. It does not request all relevant information, namely, on national overall production and stockpiling of such arms. Furthermore, it does not provide for information on other fields of armaments, be they nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction.

We deplore the fact that nuclear armaments continue to enjoy special attention. In the Middle East, this is causing serious concern, in particular with Israel's continued refusal to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards while at the same time it enjoys considerable unsafeguarded nuclear and mass-destruction capabilities.

This is why my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

**Mr. Goonetilleke** (Sri Lanka): I have asked to speak to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18: "Transparency in armaments". As it did last year, Sri Lanka abstained in the voting on the two operative paragraphs as well as on the draft resolution as a whole. It is not that we have any problems with transparency or confidence-building measures. Indeed, Sri Lanka supports transparency and confidence-building measures.

Our difficulty has been twofold. First, we believe that transparency in armaments cannot be achieved in a selective manner. We cannot take conventional weapons into consideration and totally ignore weapons of mass destruction. Secondly, we cannot be selective in dealing with conventional weapons, as is done in the case of the United Nations Register, which is of limited scope.

For those reasons, my delegation decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, and we hope that in future the subject will be dealt with in the Conference on Disarmament, where we will be able to deal with transparency measures in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner.

**The Chairman:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 in cluster 2. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 11th meeting of the Committee on 26 October 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lithuania, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

I should also like to recall that the programme implications of the draft resolution will be issued tomorrow in document A/C.1/50/L.59, portions of which I read into the record earlier this morning.

**The Chairman:** I now call upon representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Boisson** (Monaco)(*interpretation from French*): I merely wanted to indicate that the Principality of Monaco wishes to become a sponsor of A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

**The Chairman:** The Secretariat has taken note of the wish of the representative of Monaco.

**Mr. Osman** (Afghanistan): The Afghanistan delegation would like to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

**The Chairman:** The Secretariat will take note of that request.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of position.

**Mr. Yativ** (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on this draft resolution because it supports the objective of global prohibition of biological weapons. In our view, any arrangement reached must include, in a comprehensive manner, all the States in the region of the Middle East. Furthermore, arrangements involving compliance in enforcement require the establishment of a credible verification regime so as to confer confidence in the Convention.

**The Chairman:** We have heard the only speaker in exercise of position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1.Rev.1.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

I now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

**Mr. Felicio** (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil will have to abstain in the voting on A/C.1/50/L.40 for two main reasons. First, we cannot agree with the third preambular paragraph, which states that:

> "conventional arms control needs to be pursued primarily in the regional and subregional contexts"

On the contrary, we believe that regional disarmament is complementary to global efforts towards disarmament.

The second reason for our abstention relates to operative paragraph 2, in which the General Assembly would request the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. As we all know, the Conference on Disarmament has as its primary task the negotiation of disarmament agreements. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the Conference to embark on the formulation of principles, as requested in the draft resolution.

Those are the reasons for our abstention.

**The Chairman:** We have heard the only speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): With the Committee's indulgence, I should like to make a short statement — more in a spirit of levity than in exercise of a right of reply.

First of all, I wish to say that I listened with great interest — and great attention — to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador de Icaza, who is also a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, when he asked that I might proceed at a slightly slower pace when conducting the voting. Unfortunately, there is a very good saying that goes, "One man's meat is another man's poison." I recall earlier occasions when I have been asked to proceed a bit faster. I surely do not want a procedural vote on this matter and, accordingly, I fully defer to the judgement of Ambassador de Icaza, which I truly and highly value, and I shall try to calibrate the speed in a manner that will please all delegations, to the extent possible.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Djibouti,

Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

India

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 was adopted by 156 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40, "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Benin, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Haiti, Nepal, Pakistan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Cuba, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40 was adopted by 150 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

**The Chairman**: I now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

We have noted that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 does not take into account the ideas contained in the "Guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security" (A/48/42, annex II), which were developed by the Disarmament Commission after detailed and extensive debates and discussions in 1993 and which, *inter alia*, stipulated that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should be agreed to freely among all the participating States, on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of all States concerned, and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region. Further, the States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements among them apply. Regional arrangements should also take into account the need to address broader, non-military factors which affect security. Finally, regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address, in all its aspects, the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

Not only do these elements find no specific mention in the draft resolution, but in contending that States with larger military capabilities or militarily significant States have a special responsibility in promoting such agreements, the text ignores the fact that such States also have wider security concerns and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, while making a reference to the 1993 session of the Disarmament Commission consensus report on regional approaches to disarmament, also largely ignores its guidelines and recommendations on the subject. For instance, while the Disarmament Commission guidelines recognize that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security at the lowest possible level of armaments and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focuses only on the security of smaller States and contends that the enhancement thereof would automatically reduce the risk of regional conflicts. We feel that it is more realistic to recognize, as was done by the Disarmament Commission, that the security concerns of all States, big and small, must be equally met in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts.

The draft resolution, furthermore, seeks to address nuclear non-proliferation not only at a regional level but also on a subregional basis. Even the Disarmament Commission did not go so far as to contemplate dealing with nuclear non-proliferation on a subregional basis. As indicated by us earlier and on another occasion, and as is well known, we are of the view that nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is a global issue which can only be dealt with effectively globally.

Let me add that India is not against the concept of regional disarmament nor, indeed, of multilateral discussions on conventional weapons. Where draft resolutions on regional disarmament have been developed, largely on the basis of the paper adopted by the Disarmament Commission by consensus, as was the case in regard to resolution 48/75 G in 1993, we had gone along with the consensus. As I have just stated, this is not the case with the two draft resolutions submitted this year. This has constrained us to abstain in the vote on both of them.

**Mr. Jusuf** (Indonesia): I wish to note that the name of Indonesia is not shown as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38. I would ask that the omission be rectified in the Committee's report.

**The Chairman**: The statement of the representative of Indonesia will be reflected in the proceedings.

**Mr. Rivero Rosario** (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain Cuba's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40. The delegation of Cuba joined in the consensus on resolution 48/75 G on regional disarmament, adopted at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, and it supports the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament, which were debated in the Disarmament Commission at length and in depth. In the opinion of our delegation they reflect quite faithfully the interests of all delegations on the subject of regional disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 refers to the same issue of regional disarmament, but in my delegation's view, certain ideas of particular importance, such as the initiative and participation of all States in a given region in negotiating and adopting regional disarmament measures, have been omitted. None the less, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 because we felt it did cover some useful points.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40, in our view that text also singles out specific aspects in an unbalanced way. In addressing the question of regional approaches to disarmament, the text expresses certain ideas that we cannot accept and that are not in keeping with measures negotiated in the Disarmament Commission and adopted by the General Assembly, such as the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament.

As was the case with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, the preambular portion of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40 omits the question of the initiative taken by, and the participation of all States in the region in the disarmament process. Also overlooked is the key consideration of taking into account the legitimate defence needs of the States. ON the other hand, in establishing that control of conventional weapons needs to be pursued primarily in the regional and subregional contexts the need for global control of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is overlooked. The text also omits mention of the influence of and interrelation with the control of conventional weapons on a global scale.

With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament has some very important negotiations before it, such as the initiation or conclusion, as the case may be, of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. That negotiating forum should not be distracted from its tasks of highest priority.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38.

**The Chairman**: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27 in cluster 8.

No delegation has asked to explain its vote before the voting. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 17th meeting on 9 November 1995.

As the Chairman stated, a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland,

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

*Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27 was adopted by 115 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.*

**The Chairman**: I now call upon representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

**Mr. Madden** (United States of America): As was the case last year, the United States was again obliged to vote against the draft resolution on "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace" — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27. As we have repeatedly made clear, the draft resolution must at a minimum recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We believe that the freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea-lanes passage should be explicitly acknowledged, in addition to freedom of navigation on the high seas.

Further, in these times of financial crisis the United States believes that the United Nations can no longer afford to support bodies such as the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean that have outlived their usefulness. Elimination of the Ad Hoc Committee, a vestige of the cold war, would be a highly visible symbol that the United Nations is adjusting to the challenges of the twenty-first century. The Ad Hoc Committee's effort in recent years to find some purpose and focus for its activities is the clearest evidence that its time has passed.

The United States believes that the States of the region should recognize that financial responsibility dictates addressing issues of security and peaceful resolution of disputes in an appropriate regional forum, as is done in the South Atlantic region. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations.

We note that the Ad Hoc Committee will not meet in a regular session this year. Although this is a positive development, we had hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee could have avoided meeting at all in 1996. Instead, the United States believes, the regional participants should endeavour to identify an appropriate regional forum to which their substantive discussions can be devolved. We look forward to next year's draft resolution accomplishing this.

**The Chairman**: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

Before concluding our work for today, I should like to go through the list of draft resolutions that could be adopted tomorrow. The Committee will have two meetings.

At the morning meeting the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and L.50/Rev.2;

In cluster 3: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43;

In cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 and L.25.

In the afternoon, the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 1: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): In cluster 1, I think that the Committee could also take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8. Revision 1 to that draft resolution will have been circulated in the morning, and it is our hope that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus. Perhaps it could even be the first item on the afternoon agenda.

**The Chairman:** If I understand the representative of Mexico correctly, he would like to have draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1 in cluster 1 considered as the first item at the afternoon meeting. If I am not mistaken, we agreed yesterday that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would be the first order of business at the afternoon meeting, at 3 o'clock sharp. I would ask whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would agree to have that draft resolution considered after A/C.1/50/L.8.

I would ask the representative of Mexico if I am correct in understanding that A/C.1/50/L.3 will be taken up tomorrow afternoon as the second item, following A/C.1/50/L.8?

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The order of consideration does not matter, as far as my delegation is concerned. I believe, however, that there might be a problem with the circulation of revision 1 to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8, and therefore perhaps it might be better to leave it until Friday.

**The Chairman:** Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8 is therefore deferred until Friday.

I would remind delegations that it had been agreed yesterday that A/C.1/50/L.3 would be taken up first tomorrow, at 3 p.m. sharp. I do not want to go into my motive for saying "3 p.m. sharp". Every delegation knows about the intensive consultations we had yesterday afternoon.

**Mr. Goosen** (South Africa): We were wondering whether it would perhaps be possible to consider draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, on regional centres, which falls within cluster 7, at the meeting tomorrow morning.

**The Chairman:** The Secretariat informs me that because of the financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31 the Committee will not be able to consider them tomorrow morning. We will let delegations know the status of those two draft resolutions tomorrow morning.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to return to a point mentioned earlier, concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, in cluster 11. I would request that that draft resolution not be considered tomorrow but on Friday.

**The Chairman:** Consideration of A/C.1/50/L.25 will be deferred.

Tomorrow afternoon we will deal first, in cluster 1, with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

In cluster 8, the Chair proposes that we deal with draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.13 and L.48.

**Mr. Bandura** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I submitted draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 today, and we request that it be considered first tomorrow, if possible.

**The Chairman:** As you are well aware, according to the rules of procedure we must consider draft resolutions in the order in which they have been submitted. The first order of business will therefore be A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, and then A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2.

I would like to inform delegations that the Committee has taken action on 27 draft resolutions and decisions so far. We have done a little over half of what we are supposed to do. Delegations need not be reminded of the fact that not much time is left, and I hope that in the days to come representatives will bear that fact in mind.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): I have been requested to make the following announcements.

A meeting of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries "on First Committee matters" will be held tomorrow, 16 November, at 9 a.m. in Conference Room D. At the conclusion of this meeting, the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement will hold a meeting in this Conference Room.

There will also be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.1 in Conference Room 9 immediately following the conclusion of this meeting.

Finally, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, "The role of science and technology", will hold a meeting in Room A immediately following the conclusion of this meeting.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*